No 5573.149

211-220

GIVEN BY

US Supt of Document

* 5573.149

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF LABOR
FRANCES PERKINS, Secretary
CHILDREN'S BUREAU
GRACE ABBOTT, Chief

Mothers' Aid, 1931

Bureau Publication No. 220

UNITED STATES
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON : 1933

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, Washington, D.C. - - - - - - - - - - - - - - Price 5 cents

U. S. GOVERNMENT OF DOCUMENTS
AUG 29 1933

CONTENTS

	Page
Letter of transmittal	v
Characteristics of mothers' aid	1
Development in legislation	2
Persons eligible for aid	3
Ages of children	4
Amount of grant permitted	4
Administration	5
Growth in mothers' aid	6
Types of families aided	11
Persons caring for children and status of fathers	11
Race of mothers	13
Expenditures for mothers' aid by States	14
Per capital expenditures	14
Average monthly grants	16
Families aided per 10,000 population	18
Expenditures for administration and services	20
Expenditures for mothers' aid by States	22
Summary and conclusions	23
Appendix A.—Tables	25
Appendix B.—Expenditures for mothers' aid in 1931 and in 1932	35

LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
CHILDREN'S BUREAU,
Washington, June 27, 1933.

MADAM: There is transmitted herewith the report of a Nation-wide usrvey of the extent of mothers' aid in the United States in the year 1931. A similar survey was made by the Children's Bureau in 1921 and 1922, when mothers' aid laws in the different States had been in operation 1 to 10 years. This form of public provision for social needs aims to preserve for dependent children care by their own mothers under conditions tending to make possible normal home life. Its steady growth is one of the most constructive achievements in the public-welfare field in the past quarter century.

For the data collected the Bureau is indebted to State departments and local agencies having direct or supervisory responsibility for mothers' aid administration.

Respectfully submitted.

GRACE ABBOTT, *Chief.*

HON. FRANCES PERKINS,
Secretary of Labor.

MOTHERS' AID, 1931

The progress in public provision for dependent children that enables mothers to care for them in their own homes has been one of the most significant developments in the field of public welfare during the last two decades. This development can be seen in improved legislation, increase in the number of families benefiting by such provisions, more liberal local and State funds, and growth in the number of administrative units providing such aid. Back of these developments lie recognition of the essential values of home life in the rearing of children and acceptance of the principle that no child should be separated from his family because of poverty alone.

CHARACTERISTICS OF MOTHERS' AID

Twenty years ago mothers' aid or mothers' assistance allowances or mothers' pensions as they were called, represented a new departure in public relief administration, and the characteristics of legislative provisions and of administrative practice that have been developed are, therefore, of great significance.

In general, mothers' aid laws provide for aid to families having young children that have become dependent through the loss or disability of the breadwinner and that may be expected to be dependent for a relatively long time, usually during the period when the children are too young to work. With few exceptions the beneficiaries are families of men who are dead or divorced, who have deserted, or who are disabled or imprisoned. The laws include provisions whose purpose is to assure that the children assisted shall have home influences suitable to their upbringing. One qualification for eligibility as expressed in the statutes of all but one of the States (Maryland) having a mothers' aid law is that the mother shall be a proper person to have the care of her children, and in a number of States a further requirement is made that the home shall be a satisfactory place for the rearing of children.

A noteworthy characteristic of mothers' aid legislation is the explicit or implied provision that the grant shall be sufficient, when supplemented by such income as the family has, to maintain the family at a reasonable standard of living without the necessity of outside employment of the mother, which would mean neglect of her children. In 11 States and the District of Columbia the amount that may be granted is unrestricted; in all others a limitation upon the maximum grant that may be given nullifies this provision to some extent. Even when the allowance granted is inadequate, beneficiaries are able to maintain some sense of security and self-respect through the following universally accepted principles: That the grant shall be determined in advance; that it may be and in all probability will be continued, if the need persists, so long as the children are within

the age limitation specified in the law; that it is paid at regular intervals without reapplication for each allowance; and that, except in unusual instances, it is in the form of money paid to the mother to be spent at her discretion.

In most States some requirements as to a period of residence by the mother or father within the town, city, county, or State are specified in the law. Citizenship or a declaration to become a citizen is also required in a few States. Provisions as to limitation on the amount of property the mother may hold are included in the laws of some States.

Unlike the older poor-relief laws, the great majority of mothers' aid statutes specifically require the investigation of each application and some supervision of families receiving grants.

On the basis of this legislation, administrative practices have been developed in many jurisdictions to provide allowances suited to the needs of each family and sufficient to maintain standards of living contributing positively to the welfare of children; to discover the social and personal needs of beneficiaries, and to help in meeting these through the assistance of trained social workers. The use of a family budget computed separately for each family on the basis of a standard family budget is one of the most widely adopted practices. The social services rendered families include: Assistance in obtaining proper housing and in using community resources for health, education, vocational placement, and leisure-time activities; education of the mother in income management, food values, child care, and child guidance; and assistance in personality adjustment when this is needed.

DEVELOPMENT IN LEGISLATION

The first State-wide mothers' aid law was passed by Illinois in 1911, although previously a number of localities in other States had made public funds available to board children in their own homes or to assist the mother so that children might remain in school. Colorado followed Illinois with a similar law in 1913, and during this year 17 other States enacted such legislation. The opportunity afforded by such laws to provide more adequate assistance for dependent children in their own homes than had been available under existing methods of poor-relief administration and private charity was immediately recognized, and within 10 years after the passage of the first law (by the end of 1921) 40 States and the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii had made some legislative provision for the support of dependent children in their own homes from public funds.[1] By June 30, 1931, 5 more States and the District of Columbia had added mothers' aid laws, New Mexico being the latest addition to the list, having passed a mothers' aid law in March 1931. At that time only 3 States—Alabama, Georgia, and South Carolina—had no mothers' aid laws, but in July 1931 Alabama authorized the counties to provide funds for care of dependent children under 18 years of age in their own homes.[2]

In most of the States mothers' aid laws have been amended, often a number of times, since their original enactment. In some States

[1] The following discussion is limited to the United States proper.

[2] The statute, however, does not include any of the specific requirements as to persons eligible embodied in mothers' aid laws and has not been included in the following discussion of mothers' aid legislation.

the laws have been completely rewritten.[3] The general tendency in the legislation, particularly that passed in the last 10 years, has been to make the benefits of the law available to more children, to make the grants more nearly equal to the needs of the families, to improve administrative provisions in keeping with good social practice, and to provide for increased participation by the State through funds or powers of supervision over local agencies.

PERSONS ELIGIBLE FOR AID

In the early years mothers' aid was limited in its application in many States. Of the 39 States having mothers' aid laws in 1919, only 10 made provision possible for all groups of families that are usually specified as eligible for assistance in mothers' aid laws (that is, father dead, deserting, divorced, imprisoned, or physically or mentally incapacitated), 20 definitely excluded one or more of these groups, and 9 provided only for assistance to widows. As a result of new legislation and amendments to earlier laws, provisions have been broadened, and mothers' aid has been made available to an increasingly larger number of families.

By June 30, 1931, the laws of only 2 of the 45 States and the District of Columbia having mothers' aid laws (Connecticut and Utah) restricted aid to widows. In 10 States [4] and the District of Columbia aid may be granted to any needy mother or to any mother with dependent children, and in 10 other States [5] the laws are almost as liberal, making assistance available to all dependent families in which the father is dead, deserting, divorced, physically or mentally incapacitated, or imprisoned. In the other 23 States aid may be granted to widows and to certain other groups of mothers. In 15 [6] of these States deserted mothers may receive aid, in 1 (Texas) divorced mothers, in 17 [7] mothers whose husbands are imprisoned, and in 23 mothers whose husbands are physically or mentally incapacitated. In 18 States [8] providing for families in which the father is incapacitated, aid may be made available under a number of different conditions, but in 5 [9] States it is limited to families in which the father is in an institution.

An expectant mother is eligible for aid under the laws of 7 States [10] and unmarried mothers are specifically made eligible for aid by the laws of 3 States.[11] The laws of 18 States [12] and the District of Columbia expressly state that aid may be granted to persons other than the mothers, usually the guardian or other person standing in place of a parent, but in a few States relatives are specified. Five of

[3] Louisiana is the latest State to have reenacted its mothers' aid legislation. The first Louisiana law was enacted in 1920. This law was amended in 1928. In 1930 the law was completely revised. In the legislative summary material the 1930 law is included, although when this report was prepared the new law had not been put into operation because of the failure of the legislature to make the necessary appropriations.

[4] Colorado, Indiana, Kentucky, Maine, Massachusetts, Mississippi, Nevada, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, and Washington

[5] Florida, Kansas, Michigan, Missouri, Nebraska, New Mexico, North Carolina, South Dakota, Virginia, and Wisconsin.

[6] Arizona, Arkansas, Delaware, Illinois, Louisiana, Minnesota, New Jersey, New York, North Dakota, Ohio, Tennessee, Texas, Vermont, West Virginia, and Wyoming

[7] Arkansas, California, Delaware, Idaho, Iowa, Louisiana, Minnesota, Montana, New Jersey, New York, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Tennessee, Texas, and Wyoming.

[8] Arizona, Arkansas, California, Delaware, Illinois, Louisiana, Maryland, Minnesota, Montana, New Jersey, New York, North Dakota, Ohio, Oregon, Tennessee, Vermont, West Virginia, and Wyoming.

[9] Idaho, Iowa, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, and Texas.

[10] Colorado, Louisiana, Missouri, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, Virginia, and Wisconsin.

[11] Michigan, Nebraska, and Tennessee.

[12] California, Colorado, Delaware, Florida, Idaho, Kentucky, Louisiana, Minnesota, Mississippi, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, Rhode Island, South Dakota, Virginia, and Wisconsin.

these States [13] include fathers in the persons to whom aid may be given.

AGES OF CHILDREN

Since the summary of mothers' aid laws was made by the Children's Bureau in 1919,[14] 10 of the States having mothers' aid laws at that time have raised the age limit for children eligible for aid and 1 State (Kansas) has set a lower limit. As the laws now stand, in all but 2 States that have enacted mothers' aid legislation (Kansas and Oklahoma) children can receive aid until they are legally exempt from school attendance. The grant must stop when a child reaches 14 years of age in only 4 States and 1 city (Kansas, North Carolina, Oklahoma, Wyoming, and St. Louis, Mo.) and at 15 years in 4 other States (Arkansas, Idaho, North Dakota, and Washington). In the remaining States and the District of Columbia aid may be granted until a child is 16 years, or in Michigan and Tennessee until he is 17 years, and in Colorado until he is 18 years.[15] Seven of the States having a 16-year age limit grant aid up to 16 only for children attending school with a satisfactory record, or for those who are ill or incapacitated for work;[16] the grant may be extended beyond 16 years under such conditions in 4 other States.[17]

AMOUNT OF GRANT PERMITTED

A grant fixed not by the law but by the administrative agency so that it can be adjusted in accordance with the individual family needs and resources has come to be recognized as having decided advantages. The laws of some States recognize this method by not specifying the amount that may be paid to a family, but providing that it shall be left to the discretion of the administrative agency to decide the amount necessary to maintain the child or children properly in their own homes with their mothers. This more progressive type of provision has been adopted by 11 States [18] and the District of Columbia.[19] In New York State aid is restricted to an amount not exceeding the cost of institutional care. The other 33 States specify the maximum that may be granted; in most cases a monthly amount, or in some cases a daily or weekly amount, is allowed for the first child and a smaller sum for each additional child. Ten States [20] limit the grant further by specifying the maximum amount a month that may be granted to any family irrespective of its size. In no State does this maximum exceed $75, and in some it is as low as $40. In all but two of these States the maximum amount allowed for individual children is also specified.

---

[13] California, Colorado, Mississippi, New Hampshire, and Wisconsin.
[14] Laws Relating to Mothers' Pensions in the United States, Canada, Denmark, and New Zealand. U.S. Children's Bureau Publication No. 63. Washington, 1919
[15] In Indiana aid may be granted to girls under 17 years of age.
[16] Kentucky, Maryland, Minnesota, New Mexico, Oregon, Rhode Island, and West Virginia.
[17] Florida, Nevada, Ohio, and Wisconsin.
[18] Arizona, Colorado, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Mississippi, Rhode Island, Virginia, and Wisconsin.
[19] The 1932 appropriation act for the District of Columbia placed a limitation of $100 as the maximum amount to be allowed to any family. This was in force during the life of the appropriation act.
[20] Kansas, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Mexico, North Carolina, Oregon, Utah, and West Virginia.

The number of children in the family eligible for aid is one of the most important factors in determining the amount of aid given, its influence being especially marked since in most States the amount that may be given for each child is stated in the law. In actual practice the relative numbers of large families and small families granted aid vary somewhat with the policies of the different administrative agencies. In some jurisdictions few or no mothers with only 1 eligible child are given mothers' aid, whereas in other jurisdictions a large proportion of the families have but 1 or 2 children. Information obtained in 1931 shows that the average size of all mothers' aid families within the different States varied from 2.2 children per family in the State of Washington to 3.7 children in Maryland, Missouri, and the District of Columbia, the average for the United States areas reporting being slightly less than 3 children (2.7) per family aided.

Using a family of 3 children as a basis for comparison of the grants that may be given in States that limit aid to a definite amount per child, it is found that for such a family 4 States [21] permit a maximum grant of $60 to $70; 5 States, [22] $50 to $59; 9 States, [23] $40 to $49; 8 States, [24] $30 to $39; and 7 States, [25] $20 to $29. The laws of Connecticut, Delaware, Kansas, and North Carolina specify that additional amounts may be allowed under certain circumstances.

ADMINISTRATION

One of the most significant developments in mothers' aid legislation has been the steady increase in the number of States that have made some provision for State participation in the administration of mothers' aid. Seventeen States have provided State funds for this purpose. In Arizona and New Hampshire allowances and administrative expenses are paid entirely from State funds. The payment of State funds to augment mothers' aid funds made available by the local government has been authorized in 14 States.[26] In New Jersey State funds are available only for the salaries and expenses of the State staff, which is responsible for providing services and supervision to all mothers' aid families.

With the payment of State funds has come some degree of State responsibility for administration of aid. Complete or major responsibility for administration has been given to a State agency in 8 States.[27] In the remaining 9 States [28] authorizing payments from State funds, the major responsibility for administration is vested in a local agency, but a designated State agency is responsible for the administration of the State contribution and for more or less supervision of administration by the local agency. In some States (for example, California, Massachusetts, and Pennsylvania) a special State staff has been provided for assistance to the local agencies in the administration of State and local funds. In Illinois and North Carolina super-

[21] California, Connecticut, Indiana, and Michigan.
[22] Kansas, Minnesota, Nevada, Ohio, and Oregon.
[23] Florida, New Jersey, New Mexico, North Dakota, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, Utah, West Virginia, and Wyoming.
[24] Illinois, Iowa, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, New Hampshire, North Carolina, and Tennessee.
[25] Arkansas, Delaware, Idaho, Oklahoma, Texas, Vermont, and Washington.
[26] California, Connecticut, Delaware, Illinois, Louisiana, Maine, Massachusetts, New Mexico, North Carolina, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Virginia, Vermont, and Wisconsin.
[27] Arizona, Connecticut, Delaware, Maine, New Hampshire, New Jersey, Rhode Island, and Vermont.
[28] California, Illinois, Louisiana, Massachusetts, New Mexico, North Carolina, Pennsylvania, Virginia and Wisconsin.

vision of mothers' aid is combined with other activities of the staff of the State department of welfare. State activity in Virginia and Wisconsin has been limited, owing to the inadequacy of State appropriations. The Louisiana and New Mexico laws providing for State funds and local administration have not been put into operation because of failure of the State legislatures to appropriate State funds.

In a number of States that have not granted State funds for mothers' aid the need for developing standards of administration throughout the State has been recognized. State supervision of mothers' aid administration has been provided for in the mothers' aid laws of Kentucky, Minnesota, Missouri, New York, and North Dakota. New York is the only one of these States that has provided a special supervisory staff which keeps in close contact with the county boards of child welfare, the local administrative agencies in New York.

In addition to the 9 States providing State funds but placing major responsibility for administration on local agencies, 28 States have made administration of mothers' aid entirely a local problem. In selecting the local agency in which responsibility for administration was to be placed, much thought has been given to the character of the services that could be furnished by existing agencies and to the value or the disadvantages in creating special agencies. Following the precedent established in Illinois, which provided the first State-wide mothers' aid law, the juvenile court was made the administrative agency in a large proportion of the States enacting mothers' aid laws during the early years. With the growth of appreciation of the necessity of establishing county social-service agencies, a definite tendency is found in recent legislation toward selecting such agencies to administer mothers' aid. Thus 6 of the 10 States that have passed mothers' aid laws since 1919 provide for administration by a county welfare board.

Seventeen of the 37 States with local administration have placed responsibility for mothers' aid in the juvenile court.[29] In 13 States [30] the county commissioners or local officials responsible for administration of poor relief are designated as the administrative agency, and in 7 States [31] county welfare boards with other responsibilities for children or specially created to administer mothers' aid have been charged with this responsibility.

GROWTH IN MOTHERS' AID

Progress in the different States in the development of administrative units and in the number of families benefiting from mothers' aid is shown in table 1, which summarizes the findings of two surveys of mothers' aid administration made by the Children's Bureau in 1921 and 1931. Because the length of time that the mothers' aid law has been in operation influences to some extent the extension of such aid throughout a State, the year in which the law was enacted is shown for each State. Information as to the number of administrative units authorized to grant mothers' aid is also shown for all States that have adopted the county as a unit of administration.

[29] Arkansas, Colorado, Idaho, Illinois, Iowa, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Montana, Nebraska, Oklahoma, Ohio, Oregon, South Dakota, Tennessee, Washington, and Wisconsin.
[30] California, Florida, Kansas, Maryland, Massachusetts, Missouri, Nevada, New Mexico, North Dakota, Texas, Utah, West Virginia, and Wyoming.
[31] Indiana, Kentucky, Louisiana, New York, North Carolina, Pennsylvania, and Virginia.

The first country-wide survey of the extent to which mothers' aid had been made available was undertaken by the Children's Bureau in 1921 and 1922. By the end of 1921, 40 States had mothers' aid laws.[32] At the time of the 1921 survey the laws in the different States had been in operation 1 to 10 years. Because of the inadequacy of the records, it was impossible at the time of this survey to get accurate figures from many counties as to the number of children in the families aided, but it was estimated that approximately 120,000 children were receiving aid on any given date. The questionnaires returned by many of the counties in some States indicated that the agencies in these counties had little understanding of what mothers' aid was, and it is probable that many of the families reported were actually receiving poor relief only. No information as to mothers' aid could be obtained from 6 States at that time (1921–22).

In order to measure the progress made in mothers' aid administration, information was obtained in 1931 as to the situation at that time.[33] Returns were received from all States having mothers' aid laws, with the exception of New Mexico, which had just enacted legislation.[34] In the New England States mothers' aid is administered by the State, city, or town rather than by the county, so that reports were made on a State basis since aid was available to families throughout the entire State. In the remaining States the county (or the parish in Louisiana) is the administrative unit, with the exception of 24 independent cities in Virginia and the cities of St. Louis, Mo., and Baltimore, Md. Information was obtained from all but 242 of the 2,723 administrative units that were authorized to grant mothers' aid in these States and the District of Columbia.

The 242 counties from which no reports were received in 1931 were scattered through 17 States, more than half of them, however, being located in Louisiana, Missouri, and Texas. Many of these counties probably were not granting aid, but some may have merely failed to report. Reports from 903 counties and cities in 32 States definitely stated that no mothers' aid was being granted. More than one fifth of these counties were in Kentucky and Mississippi, which did not enact mothers' aid laws until 1928, and in Maryland, which passed its State-wide law in 1929. The remaining counties and cities were in States that had authorized mothers' aid for a period of from 8 to 20 years.

Counties having large populations usually make provision for mothers' aid. However, 42 counties with populations of more than 50,000 were among those not granting aid, including 2 independent cities and 12 counties containing cities with populations of 50,000 and under 500,000. As is shown by the following list, these 14 cities

[32] Arizona had reenacted in 1921 an earlier law which had been repealed.

[33] In 1926 information as to the number of families and children aided and the amounts spent for their care was obtained from all States in which the State department of welfare could provide these figures, and for all but a few of the cities of 100,000 population or counties including such cities. See Public Aid to Mothers with Dependent Children, pp. 20–24 (U.S. Children's Bureau Publication No. 162, Washington, 1928).

[34] The State departments of public welfare in most of the 27 States in which the department has been given authority to obtain reports as to mothers' aid administration from local administrative units and in a few others which volunteered such services supplied the information from records in their offices or sent out questionnaires to the counties and compiled the statistics for their States. The Children's Bureau obtained information directly from the local administrative agency in 17 States through questionnaires and letters sent to the agencies. A number of State departments that were unable to assemble the material assisted by sending follow-up letters to the counties that failed to respond to the letters sent by the Children's Bureau.

were in different parts of the country: Kansas City, Kans.[34a]; Covington, Ky.; New Orleans, La.; St. Joseph and Springfield, Mo.; Schenectady, N.Y.; Nashville and Chattanooga, Tenn.; Austin, San Antonio, El Paso, and Waco, Tex.; and Roanoke and Norfolk, Va.

The increase during the 10-year period in the number of counties and cities granting aid, and in the number of families aided, may be seen in table 1. In 1921 New Jersey and Delaware, of the States using the county as the unit of administration, had made mothers' aid available throughout the State. In both these States mothers' aid is administered by a State agency. By 1931 Arizona, California, Ohio, Wisconsin, and Washington had joined the group of States in which mothers' assistance is really State-wide, except that one county in California which has a population of only 241 reported no aid granted. Definite increase in the number of administrative units known to be granting mothers' aid is shown by reports from the majority of the other States. In 11 States [35] the information received from 88 counties indicated that the aid given to more than 2,000 families more nearly resembled poor relief than mothers' aid. (See p. 9.) These counties, which had given some assistance to families with dependent children, were not considered as having granted mothers' aid if the information sent apparently included families receiving poor relief and if grants were made in kind instead of cash. The apparent decrease since 1921 in the number of counties granting aid in some of these States is probably due to the inadequacy of records and reporting at the earlier period, which made it difficult to make any distinction between these two forms of aid.

TABLE 1.—*Date of passage of first mothers' aid law, number of administrative units in each State and number of units reporting mothers' aid grants in 1921 and on a specified date [1] in 1931, and number of families and number of children receiving aid*

Division and State	Date of passage of the first mothers' aid law	Number of administrative units in States having county jurisdiction	Number of administrative units reporting mothers' aid grants in States having county jurisdiction		Number of families receiving aid—		Number of children receiving aid on a specified date in 1931 [1]
			1921	June 30, 1931	During 1921 or 1922	On a specified date in 1931 [1]	
Total	----------	2,723	1,049	1,490	45,825	93,620	253,298
New England:							
Maine	1917	(2)	(2)	(2)	638	608	[3] 1,763
New Hampshire	1913	(2)	(2)	(2)	[4] 144	175	516
Vermont	1917	(2)	(2)	(2)	43	90	239
Massachusetts	1913	(2)	(2)	(2)	3,391	2,817	7,235
Rhode Island	1923	(2)	----------	(2)	----------	388	1,253
Connecticut	1919	(2)	(2)	(2)	603	959	2,679

[1] Most administrative units reported as of June 30, 1931.
[2] Unit of administration is city or town.
[3] Estimate.
[4] Number receiving aid on a given date.

[34a] In 1931 a statement was received from the commissioner of the poor that mothers' aid was not granted in Kansas City, but in May 1933 information was obtained that 4 families were receiving mothers' aid from the general revenue fund of the county.

[35] Kansas, Missouri, Montana, Nevada, North Dakota, Oregon, South Dakota, Texas, Utah, West Virginia, and Wyoming.

TABLE 1.—*Date of passage of first mothers' aid law, number of administrative units in each State and number of units reporting mothers' aid grants in 1921 and on a specified date in 1931, and number of families and number of children receiving aid*—Continued

Division and State	Date of passage of the first mothers' aid law	Number of administrative units in States having county jurisdiction	Number of administrative units reporting mothers' aid grants in States having county jurisdiction		Number of families receiving aid—		Number of children receiving aid on a specified date in 1931
			1921	June 30, 1931	During 1921 or 1922	On a specified date in 1931	
Middle Atlantic:							
New York	1915	58	48	49	12,542	18,423	48,686
New Jersey	1913	21	21	21	2,472	[3] 7,000	[5] 19,361
Pennsylvania	1913	67	50	57	[4] 2,494	6,066	18,674
East North Central:							
Ohio	1913	88	86	88	5,763	7,708	21,262
Indiana	1919	92	21	70	114	1,083	3,387
Illinois	1911	102	54	91	2,500	[6] 6,087	[6] 17,004
Michigan	1913	83	70	[7] 75	2,072	6,555	18,030
Wisconsin	1913	71	70	71	3,284	[6] 7,052	[6] 18,188
West North Central:							
Minnesota	1913	87	78	85	2,265	3,455	9,990
Iowa	1913	99	64	98	1,299	[3] 3,242	[3] 7,829
Missouri	1917	[8] 115	32	[9] 11	227	307	1,134
North Dakota	1915	53	43	[9] 44	608	978	2,644
South Dakota	1913	69	44	[9] 63	423	1,290	3,324
Nebraska	1913	93	56	82	349	[10] 1,453	[10] 4,141
Kansas	1915	105	41	[9] 32	430	342	954
South Atlantic:							
Delaware	1917	3	3	3	[4] 167	314	818
Maryland	1916	[9] 24	[11]	7	[12]	121	450
District of Columbia	1926	1	----------	1	----------	161	595
Virginia	1918	[13] 124	[12]	3	[12]	110	309
West Virginia	1915	55	19	[9] 17	162	334	876
North Carolina	1923	100	----------	81	----------	433	1,461
South Carolina	----------	----------	No mothers' aid law on June 30, 1931.				
Georgia	----------	----------	No mothers' aid law on June 30, 1931.				
Florida	1919	67	5	41	168	[3] 2,298	[3] 5,241
East South Central:							
Kentucky	1928	120	----------	1	----------	117	405
Tennessee	1915	95	[12]	4	[12]	190	556
Alabama	----------	----------	No mothers' laid law on June 30, 1931.				
Mississippi	1928	82	----------	3	----------	45	110
West South Central:							
Arkansas	1917	75	4	13	136	[10] 131	[10] 355
Louisiana	1920	64	[12]	7	[12]	69	206
Oklahoma	1915	77	32	48	758	[10] 1,896	[10] 5,166
Texas	1917	254	22	[9] 23	109	475	1,383
Mountain:							
Montana	1915	56	33	[9] 46	567	839	1,969
Idaho	1913	44	33	38	229	[3] 230	[14] 619
Wyoming	1915	23	13	[9] 10	95	95	279
Colorado	1913	63	36	42	428	650	2,166
New Mexico	1931	----------	Mothers' aid law not in operation on June 30, 1931.				
Arizona	1914	14	[12]	14	[12]	131	414
Utah	1913	29	8	[9] 15	341	628	1,906
Nevada	1913	17	10	[9] 13	102	167	374
Pacific:							
Washington	1913	39	23	39	527	2,517	5,605
Oregon	1913	36	30	[9] 27	375	862	2,127
California	1913	58	[12]	57	[12]	4,729	11,615

[3] Estimate.
[4] Number receiving aid on a given date.
[5] Includes 13,031 children in 5,382 families aided under the Home Life Act and 6,330 children boarded with their mothers.
[6] Number receiving mothers' aid during the year ended June 30, 1931.
[7] Does not include 6 counties known to be granting mothers' aid which failed to reply to the questionnaire.
[8] Includes 1 independent city.
[9] Aid given was apparently poor relief rather than mothers' aid in additional counties as follows: Kansas 29, Missouri 13, Montana 6, Nevada 1, North Dakota 1, Oregon 2, South Dakota 3, Texas 9, Utah 7, West Virginia 11, Wyoming 6.
[10] Includes for a few administrative units the number receiving mothers' aid during the year ended June 30, 1931.
[11] The law was applicable to only 2 counties in 1921.
[12] Not reported.
[13] Includes 24 independent cities.
[14] Number receiving mothers' aid during the year ended Oct. 31, 1931.

The number of families reported as receiving aid in 1921 included in most localities the total number that had received aid during the year. Since new families are constantly being added to the group of beneficiaries, and the grants of others for various reasons are discontinued, the number of families aided during a year may be much larger than the number receiving aid on a given date. Figures obtained from a number of cities reporting monthly statistics to the Children's Bureau show that the families aided on December 30, 1930, were 84 percent of the entire number given some aid during the preceding year.[36] A comparison of the number of families aided on June 30, 1931, and those aided during the preceding year, in the counties and cities which reported on both of these items, showed approximately the same turnover in cases. The 93,620 families receiving aid in 1931 represents, therefore, the minimum number of families, as, except in a few instances, only those receiving aid on a given day were included. This is more than twice the number reported as receiving aid during an entire year 10 years previous. Some of the apparent decreases in families aided in 1931, compared with those aided in 1921, are due to this difference in method of counting the families aided at these two periods.

The great increase in the number of families aided—93,620 in 1931 as compared with 45,825 in 1921—is due primarily to the increase in the number of counties granting aid and to the increase in the number of families aided in counties already granting aid in 1921 rather than to the addition of Kentucky, Mississippi, North Carolina, Rhode Island, and the District of Columbia, which passed mothers' aid laws between 1921 and 1931. Reports obtained from these States and the District of Columbia show that only 1,144 families having 3,824 children were receiving aid in these areas in 1931. In addition to the extension in the number of counties and cities granting aid, more generous financial provisions by the local units or by the State, more liberal administrative policies, growth in population, and movement of population to the larger urban areas where mothers' aid was being granted, have all contributed to this increase.

The increase in number of families aided was not great in most of those States in which aid was being granted throughout the State in 1921. In three of these, Maine, New Hampshire, and Massachusetts, the number of families aided remained about the same or actually decreased. In contrast to this, New Jersey, one of this group, shows a steadily increasing use of public aid to children in their own homes as a method of providing for dependent children.[37] Although the largest percentage of increase is usually found in those States in which there has been great growth in the number of administrative units granting aid, some States, for example, New York, Ohio, and Wisconsin, show a marked increase in families aided and a relatively small addition to the number of administrative units granting aid. In those States in which some of the counties failed to distinguish between mothers' aid and poor relief, it is difficult to measure progress,

[36] Social Statistics in Child Welfare and Related Fields—Annual Report for the Registration Area for the Year 1930, by Glenn Steele, pp. 32 and 51. U.S. Children's Bureau Publication No. 209. Washington, 1932.

[37] Before 1932 families in New Jersey were assisted under two separate legislative provisions. The Act to Promote Home Life for Dependent Children provided for families of widows only and placed a definite limitation on the amount of aid to be granted, but under the Dependent Children's Act any dependent child could be boarded with its mother in its own home. In 1932 the Home Life Act was revised so as to make all groups of mothers (except divorced mothers) eligible for assistance under its provisions that are usually included in mothers' aid laws. Since the passage of this revised act, eligible families previously receiving aid under the Dependent Children's Act are being aided under the Home Life Act.

since the 1921 figures probably included many families that were actually receiving poor relief. In these States some of the counties reporting aid in 1921 were not the same as those reporting aid in 1931.

Increase in the number of families aided in a State should be accompanied by provision of funds sufficiently large to make possible adequate standards of living for all families. Unfortunately, comparable statistics as to expenditures in 1921 and 1931 are not available.

TYPES OF FAMILIES AIDED

PERSONS CARING FOR CHILDREN AND STATUS OF FATHERS

Information as to the persons caring for children receiving mothers' aid and as to the status of the fathers was obtained for the majority of families reported by 38 States and the District of Columbia. Five State departments which provided information from their own records [38] were unable to give this information, and a number of the counties in other States failed to report on these items. Appendix table A-I (p. 25) gives information as to the status of the father in 60,119 families. Mothers' aid is still limited largely to families of widows. In 49,477 families (82 percent) the father was dead, in 3,296 families (5 percent) he had deserted, in 2,325 families (4 percent) he was physically disabled, in 1,369 families (2 percent) the parents were divorced, in 1,984 families (3 percent) he was mentally disabled, and in 1,596 families (3 percent) he was in prison.

An interesting development, when studied in the light of legal limitations on eligibility (see p. 3), is the freedom with which some administrative agencies have come to interpret mothers' aid laws and provide aid for some mothers not strictly eligible for assistance. Experience has shown that in the metropolitan centers where other agencies are available and mothers' aid is administered by a special staff, the eligibility of the mother under the law is considered of primary importance in awarding a grant. In the smaller counties, however, lack of other agencies, ignorance of the law, or extreme liberality in its interpretation have placed families on the mothers' aid list for other reasons. It is probable also that because records were obtained in many localities from the county clerk, who also kept records of families receiving poor relief, the failure to discriminate between these two forms of relief resulted in the inclusion of families actually receiving poor relief. Although there are special administrative problems connected with the extension of this form of aid, the need of the security of income provided by mothers' aid is just as important for families deprived of the breadwinner for causes other than death as it is for the universally accepted one of widowhood. The need for further expansion in the types of families aided by mothers' assistance laws is evident.

In 5 [39] of the 10 States that do not provide in the statutes for assistance to deserted mothers, a few such mothers were nevertheless reported to be receiving aid. Of the 22 States making no provision for mothers who are divorced, 12 [40] reported aid given by some coun-

[38] Arizona, California, Idaho, New Jersey, and Wisconsin. Information obtained from California included all children receiving State aid rather than those under care in their own homes.

[39] Iowa, Montana, Oklahoma, Oregon, Utah.

[40] Delaware, Illinois, Iowa, Minnesota, Montana, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Utah, West Virginia, and Wyoming.

172108°—33——3

ties to divorced mothers. It is possible that in some of these States mothers who had been deserted before applying for a divorce were considered eligible on the ground of desertion. No provision is made in 8 States for families in which the father has been imprisoned; in 3[41] of these, however, aid was being granted to a few families of prisoners. With the exception of Connecticut and Utah, which provide for widows only, the needs of families in which the father is permanently disabled physically or mentally have been recognized in all States; in some of these, however, provision for the family is made only under particular conditions or for special handicaps. Michigan, Nebraska, and Tennessee have made specific provision in their statutes for granting aid to unmarried mothers, and 31 of the 55 unmarried mothers reported to have been granted aid were from these States. Although mothers' aid has not been extended to the children of the unemployed by statute in any State (except in New Hampshire as an emergency measure), in the reports received it was definitely stated in a few cases that the reason for the grant was that the father was unemployed. This is another illustration of the occasional inclusion of families receiving general relief in those reported as receiving mothers' aid.

In 23 States and in the District of Columbia a total of 1,012 persons other than the mothers were caring for dependent children and receiving mothers' aid for their support. Nearly two thirds (646) of these family groups were reported by New York State, which makes legal provision for aid to such groups. Thirteen States[42] that had made no provision in the statutes for aid to such families reported scattering numbers under care.

Even when the statutory provision is liberal, it is the willingness of the community or its administrative agency to provide, through mothers' aid, for families with different types of problems that influences the number of such families aided. The cases reported by administrative agencies in 17 States and the District of Columbia having liberal laws showed that in many localities widows constitute a large majority of the mothers aided. In these States the percentage of the families in which the father was dead varied from 54 in Washington to 93 in New Hampshire. Much difference is found in the willingness of agencies in different States to provide for families in which the father has deserted or has been divorced. In 5 States (Colorado, Florida, Kansas, Nebraska, and Washington) from 21 to 35 percent of the families assisted had needed aid because of desertion or divorce, whereas in 5 other States (Missouri, Nevada, New Hampshire, North Carolina, and Rhode Island) less than 10 percent of the families aided presented these domestic difficulties. In States having legal provisions allowing aid to deserted but not divorced mothers the number of deserted families receiving aid varied from 2 percent of the families in New York to 13 percent of the families in Wyoming. The percentage of mothers aided who were deserted by the fathers seems little affected by the specific provisions (which are found in 10 States) as to the length of time the father must have been away from the family before aid is granted.[43]

[41] Illinois, Maryland, and West Virginia.
[42] Arkansas, Kansas, Indiana, Michigan, Missouri, Montana, North Dakota, Ohio, Oregon, Texas, Utah, Washington, and West Virginia.
[43] 3 months—Kansas and Minnesota; 6 months—North Dakota; 1 year—South Dakota, Virginia, Wisconsin, and Wyoming; 2 years—New York and Texas; 3 years—Ohio.

The proportion of families aided in which the father was unable to support his family by reason of his imprisonment or physical or mental disability was usually small, but in 6 States (Arkansas, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, and North Carolina) and the District of Columbia, from 15 to 22 percent of the families belonged in these groups. In North Carolina the State appropriation has been divided so that a special fund has been made available for assistance to prisoners' families. Proportionately the State fund for prisoners' families was much more liberal than the State grant for other mothers' aid cases, which probably accounts for the large percentage of prisoners' families reported for this State. The laws of Utah and Connecticut make no provision for grants to families in which the father is mentally or physically disabled. In addition, Idaho, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, and Texas make no provision for families in which the father is physically handicapped, and provide for mental cases only when the father is under care in an institution. Iowa restricts its assistance to families in which the mentally or physically disabled father is in a State institution. New York and Michigan provide for families in which the father is receiving hospital care and for those in which a tuberculous father under adequate medical care remains in the home. In the other States any family in which the father is disabled may receive aid, especially if he is receiving hospital care. Analysis of the reports received showed that 1,076 or almost half of the 2,325 fathers who were physically incapacitated, but only 53 of the 1,984 who were mentally incapacitated, were living in the home.

RACE OF MOTHERS

Information as to the race of the mothers aided was obtained from all reporting agencies in 18 States [44] and the District of Columbia, but from only a part of those in 20 States. No information on race of mother was available for 6 States.[45] Appendix table A-II (p. 26) shows the number of families for which race was reported in these areas. Of the total number of families (46,597), 96 percent were white, 3 percent were Negro, and 1 percent belonged to other races. About half of the Negro families aided were reported by counties in Ohio and Pennsylvania.

Comparison of the percentage of Negro families in the total population of the counties reporting race, with the percentage of the families aided that were Negro, shows that provision for Negro families was limited in a number of States. The disproportion between probable need and provision is even greater when the lower income level of Negro families is taken into consideration.

An analysis of the returns from cities of 100,000 or more population and of counties including cities of such size is found in appendix table A-III (p. 27). Information as to the race of families receiving aid was obtained from 24 of these urban areas that had at least 10,000 Negroes in the total population in 1930. In Marion County, Ind., and Knox County, Tenn., the number of families receiving mothers' aid was too small to admit of valid comparison between the number of Negro and white families given aid. In 11 cities or counties [46] the

[44] Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Indiana, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Minnesota, Nevada, New Hampshire, North Carolina, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Tennessee, Utah, Vermont, and Wyoming.
[45] Arizona, Idaho, Massachusetts, New Jersey, Virginia, and Wisconsin.
[46] District of Columbia; Jefferson County, Ky.; Baltimore, Md.; Jackson County, Mo.; Cuyahoga County, Franklin County, Lucas County, and Montgomery County, Ohio; Oklahoma County, Okla.; Allegheny County and Philadelphia, Pa.

percentage of families aided that were Negro was larger than the percentage of Negro families in the administrative unit. In 9 counties [47] the percentage of families receiving mothers' aid that were Negroes was smaller than the percentage of Negro families in the county, and in 2 counties no Negro families were given mothers' aid. Limited provision for Negro families was particularly notable in 5 counties in which from 19 to 45 percent of the families were Negro; Shelby County, Tenn., and Harris County, Tex., had not provided mothers' aid to Negro families; and the 3 Florida counties had aided only a few Negro families.

EXPENDITURES FOR MOTHERS' AID BY STATES

During the year ended June 30, 1931, $33,885,487.36 was expended for grants to mothers in the 44 States and the District of Columbia reporting to the Children's Bureau. (See appendix table A-IV, p. 28.) This amount is an understatement of what was actually spent in grants in aid, as complete figures were not available for California [48] and New Jersey,[49] and no information was received from a few localities known to be granting aid.

During the year covered by the survey the increasing need for assistance to families because of the depression was bringing a large number of applicants for mothers' aid in some localities. At the same time appropriations were being curtailed or entirely withdrawn because of greatly reduced public revenues. Twenty-one of the 101 counties in four States—Arkansas, Oklahoma, Texas, and West Virginia—reporting on mothers' aid stated that aid had been discontinued during the year, or that the number of families had been reduced because of lack of public funds. Inability to collect taxes was given as the cause of such decrease in some of the counties. In one of these States only 13 of the 75 counties in the State had been giving aid, and 4 of these counties discontinued such grants before June 1931 because their funds had been exhausted. Instances of similar limitations in funds were reported from other States. The reports of most localities showed, however, that increasing need had been met by larger appropriations from local and State funds. Comparison of expenditures for mothers' aid for the year ended June 30, 1931, with those for the year ended on the same date in 1930 [50] shows that in 23 of the 30 States for which information was available, expenditures had increased.

PER CAPITA EXPENDITURES

Annual per capita expenditures based on the population of areas reporting grants have been calculated for each State. Per capita expenditures represent in some States expenditures of the entire State, in others the expenditures of a few counties only. In the individual States expenditures ranged from 3 cents per capita in North Carolina and Louisiana to 82 cents per capita in New York, with an

---

[47] New Castle, Del.; Dade, Duval, and Hillsborough, Fla.; Lake, Ind.; Erie and Westchester, N. Y.; Hamilton and Mahoning, Ohio.

[48] For 19 counties the amount of State expenditures was the only figure available. The amount spent from county funds in these counties was not reported.

[49] Only the expenditures under the act "to promote home life for dependent children" were used. Information as to payments to mothers for the care of children in their own homes under the Dependent Children's Act was not available.

[50] Lundberg, Emma O.: Child Dependency in the United States; methods of statistical reporting and a census of dependent children in 31 States. Child Welfare League of America, 1933.

expenditure of 26 cents in the States standing midway in the list. The high per capita expenditures in a few States having large populations (Massachusetts, Michigan, New York, and Wisconsin) brought the expenditures for all areas in the country granting mothers' aid to 38 cents per capita. As is shown in the following list [51] the 20 States in which expenditures were above the median in 1931 represented all sections of the country except the East South Central and West South Central divisions.

State	Annual per capita expenditure for mothers' assistance
New York	$0.82
Nevada	.64
Wisconsin	.62
Michigan	.61
Massachusetts	.55
Montana	.53
South Dakota	.52
North Dakota	.48
Minnesota	.47
New Jersey	.43
Washington	.36
Rhode Island	.35
Delaware	.35
Connecticut	.34
Iowa	.32
California	.31
Ohio	.29
Wyoming	.29
Utah	.28
Maine	.28
Illinois	.26
Pennsylvania	.26

State	Annual per capita expenditure for mothers' assistance
Florida	$0.24
Nebraska	.24
Colorado	.23
Oregon	.20
Kansas	.13
Indiana	.12
Tennessee	.11
West Virginia	.10
New Hampshire	.09
Oklahoma	.09
Idaho	.09
Virginia	.08
Vermont	.07
Texas	.06
Arizona	.06
Arkansas	.06
Missouri	.06
Mississippi	.05
Maryland	.04
Louisiana	.03
North Carolina	.03

In most States much variation existed in the extent to which the individual counties or cities had provided funds. Appendix table A-IV (p. 28) shows some rather interesting variations in different States, especially as to per capita expenditures in urban and rural areas. Fourteen States in which mothers' aid was being granted contained no city of 100,000 population or over, and yet in 6 [52] of these rural States per capita expenditures were well above the median. In 13 States [53] including large cities as well as rural and semirural areas, per capita expenditures in areas including large cities were smaller than in less populous areas. In several of these States this situation was influenced by the meager provision in the large cities, but in others, especially in Wisconsin, it was due to the more adequate expenditures of the less populous counties. Per capita expenditures in Baltimore and in the counties in Maryland were the same. In the remaining 14 States the per capita expenditure in urban areas was larger. Urban per capita expenditures were particularly high in Massachusetts and New York. Because of the large number of mothers' aid families under care in urban areas, the expenditures in one or more cities may bring up the average State expenditure. This was particularly marked in New York, in which New York

[51] Kentucky and the District of Columbia are not included since each represents only 1 administrative unit including a large city. For per capita expenditures, average monthly grants, and families aided per 10,000 population in these 2 units see appendix table A–V, p. 30.

[52] Maine, Montana, Nevada, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Wyoming.

[53] California, Delaware, Indiana, Kansas, Missouri, Oklahoma, Oregon, Rhode Island, Tennessee, Utah, Virginia, Washington, and Wisconsin. In California only State expenditures were available for the two larger cities.

City was granting aid to more than three fourths of the families aided in the State and spending $1.16 per capita.

In 13 States State funds had been made available for payment in whole or in part of this form of public aid to children in their own homes.[54] The following list shows the per capita expenditures in each of these States and the proportion of the grants that may under the statute be provided by State funds:

	Per capita expenditure
State provides total grant:	
Arizona	$0.06
New Hampshire	.09
State may provide one half of the grant:	
California	.31
Delaware	.35
Illinois	.26
Maine	.28
North Carolina	.03
Pennsylvania	.26
Rhode Island	.35
Vermont	.07
State may provide one third of the grant:	
Connecticut	.34
Massachusetts	.55
Wisconsin	.62

Per capita expenditures were low in the two States in which the total cost of the grants and of administration was borne by the State. Both of these are rural States. In the group in which one half of the expenditures for grants might be provided by the State, per capita expenditures varied from 3 cents in North Carolina to 35 cents in Delaware and Rhode Island. In four States (Delaware, Maine, Rhode Island, and Vermont) in which payment of one half of the grants was authorized by law, a State agency was administering the funds. The highest per capita expenditures were found in Massachusetts and Wisconsin, where the State statutes provided for payment by the State of one third of the grants.

In Wisconsin the State appropriation has been only about $30,000 a year, which is less than 2 percent of the total mothers' aid expenditures of the State. In North Carolina the State appropriation is limited by the law to $50,000 a year, and in 1931 one quarter of this was set aside for families of prisoners. The emphasis in the law is on matching State funds and as a result the total expenditure for grants during the year was $82,368.90. In California, where matching of State funds is permissive under the statute, some counties provided only a small amount from county funds. In this connection it should be noted that the great value of State participation in this form of relief is that it results in extending provision for dependent children more generally throughout the whole State and in developing more uniform and better standards of administration in the local agencies.

AVERAGE MONTHLY GRANTS

The size of the monthly allowance granted to a family will be influenced by the number of children eligible for aid, the amount of other contributions to the income of the family, usually from earnings of its members, and the limitations imposed by the law. The

[54] Virginia provided for State reimbursement in the law passed in 1922 of one third of the grant, but the first State appropriation ($25,000) did not become available until July 1, 1932.

average monthly allowance or grant of an administrative unit, or of a group of administrative units, represents the average of the grants given during any one month to all the families, both large and small, some of which may be partly self-sustaining and others completely dependent. Both the standards of an administrative agency and the adequacy of appropriations for mothers' aid affect the size of its average monthly grant.

The average monthly grants are calculated on expenditures for grants made during the month of June 1931.[55] The small average grant in some States would seem to indicate that in some local administrative units mothers' aid was considered as a pittance to keep the family alive rather than as a means of maintaining family life or it must be supplemented by other forms of public or private relief. The following list shows that the average monthly grant varied from $69.31 in Massachusetts to $4.33 in Arkansas; South Dakota with an average of $21.78 was the median State.

State	Average monthly grant per family	State	Average monthly grant per family
Massachusetts	$69.31	Ohio	$21.68
Rhode Island	55.09	Wisconsin	21.66
New York	52.62	Oregon	21.35
Connecticut	45.91	Vermont	21.11
Pennsylvania	37.45	Iowa	20.81
Michigan	37.04	New Hampshire	19.77
California	31.40	Washington	19.66
Maryland	30.52	Nebraska	17.81
Maine	30.16	Arizona	17.25
New Jersey	30.03	North Carolina	16.64
Minnesota	29.35	Virginia	16.52
Tennessee	26.78	West Virginia	15.46
Indiana	26.73	Kansas	14.05
Colorado	26.50	Idaho	13.16
Missouri	26.22	Utah	11.77
Illinois	26.11	Mississippi	11.11
Montana	24.78	Texas	10.07
Nevada	24.76	Louisiana	10.06
Delaware	23.69	Florida	10.01
North Dakota	22.93	Oklahoma	7.29
Wyoming	22.55	Arkansas	4.33
South Dakota	21.78		

Except in a few States little relation is to be found between statutory limitations on the allowance that may be provided and the size of the average monthly grant. In the States [56] that have no limitation on the amount, the average monthly grant varied from $11.11 to $69.31. Although the three States (Massachusetts, New York, and Rhode Island) that provided an average grant of more than $50 a month belonged in this group, it also included Arizona, Mississippi, and Virginia with grants much smaller than that of the median State of $21.78. In many States the average monthly grant fell far below the maximum grant that under the statutes might be given for a family of three children, showing that although an occasional family might obtain the maximum, the majority were receiving less. In a few States, however, particularly in Delaware, Montana, Pennsyl-

[55] Figures for other months were used for a few localities, and where no expenditures for a single month were available, a twelfth of the annual expenditures was used.

[56] Arizona, Colorado, Kentucky, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Mississippi, New York (see p. 4), Rhode Island, Virginia, and Wisconsin. The 1930 law of Louisiana has no limitation on the amount, but it was not in operation at the time of the study.

vania, and Vermont, the average monthly grant was within a few dollars of the maximum allowed by law. It is probable that with more liberal laws the grants in these States would be larger.

Comparison of the average grant in areas including large cities with that provided in areas with smaller population shows, as might be expected from the higher cost of living in large cities, that with few exceptions grants in urban areas are larger. In a number of States the difference in the size of the grant in the large cities and in other areas was slight. In Connecticut, Massachusetts, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania this is due to the large number of smaller cities included in "other areas" as well as to the fairly uniform standard of administration throughout the State. In other States, notably in Colorado, Illinois, Maryland, Michigan, and Ohio, the difference in the size of grants in these two types of areas was marked. In three States [57] (Iowa, Kansas, and Oklahoma) the cities were granting smaller allowances to families than the less populous areas. The amount that may be expended by any county in Oklahoma is limited by the statutes to $8,000. This amount is quite inadequate for the more populous counties of the State and unless the number of families aided is drastically limited there is a natural pressure towards reducing the size of the grant given.

It was the opinion of the mothers' aid committee of the White House Conference on Child Health and Protection that the only administrative units whose experience could furnish satisfactory evidence as to what constituted an adequate grant were those where the maximum grant is not limited by the statutes and where the allowance is made upon an individual budget basis.[58] This committee concluded that in 1930 "adequate grants in large urban centers will probably average $60 or more."

Appendix table A-IV (p. 28) shows that the average grant for June 1931 in 4 States (Massachusetts, Michigan, New York, and Rhode Island) was more than $50 in large urban areas, but Massachusetts was the only State having an average grant of more than $60. The figures for 82 individual administrative units including a large city, given in appendix table A-V (p. 30), show that an average monthly grant of more than $60 had been provided in only 8 cities,[59] 6 of these being situated in Massachusetts. In interpreting these figures it should be remembered that changes in the cost of living will affect the amount of monthly allowances.

FAMILIES AIDED PER 10,000 POPULATION

In order to make a comparison of the number of families aided in different localities, rates have been computed on the basis of the number aided per 10,000 population. Because mothers' aid was being granted in some States throughout the entire State and in others in only a few localities, these rates have been calculated on the populations of the governmental units actually granting aid. In these areas 93,620 families were receiving assistance. The average

[57] Figures for two large cities in California were not complete, which reduces the amount of the average grant in urban areas.

[58] The Dependent Child. White House Conference on Child Health and Protection. Century Co., New York City, 1933. In press.

[59] District of Columbia; Boston, Cambridge, Lynn, Somerville, Springfield, and Worcester, Mass.; and Westchester County, N. Y.

number of families aided per 10,000 population was 10, and the number of children was 28 per 10,000 population. Considerable variation was found in the different States as to the number of families that were receiving aid. As is shown in the following list, the rates per 10,000 population ranged from 1 in Maryland to 24 in Wisconsin, the median State, Maine, having a rate of 8.

State	Families aided per 10,000 population	State	Families aided per 10,000 population
Wisconsin	24	Kansas	8
Nevada	23	Colorado	7
South Dakota	20	Massachusetts	7
Florida	20	Pennsylvania	6
Utah	19	Connecticut	6
Montana	18	Rhode Island	6
North Dakota	18	Idaho	6
Washington	16	West Virginia	5
New York	15	Arkansas	5
Minnesota	14	Texas	4
Michigan	14	Mississippi	4
Delaware	13	Virginia	4
Iowa	13	New Hampshire	4
New Jersey	13	Indiana	4
Ohio	12	Tennessee	3
Oklahoma	12	Arizona	3
Wyoming	11	Louisiana	3
Nebraska	11	Vermont	3
Oregon	11	Missouri	2
California	8	North Carolina	2
Illinois	8	Maryland	1
Maine	8		

The wide variation in the number of families aided in the different States cannot be accounted for by differences in need. In localities where the income level of the majority of the population is low or where unusual health hazards exist, a larger number of families may be in need of assistance than in more fortunate communities. Such communities are found in many States, but they are not more numerous in those States that are granting aid to a large number of families. Administrative agencies with high standards limit their intake to the number of families that they can provide for satisfactorily, as they recognize the necessity for adequacy in the grants given. Unless appropriations are liberal this means that many families eligible for aid under the law must be cared for by other agencies. If other agencies do not exist, or if standards of administration are low, monthly allowances are sometimes reduced below a level that will provide a margin of safety for the children so that more families may be aided.

Both these situations are shown in table A-IV. An average monthly grant of more than $35 in urban areas or of more than $30 in other areas usually meant that the number of families to whom aid was granted had been kept to less than 10 families per 10,000 population.[60] The larger proportion of families aided is usually found in the less populous areas and is almost invariably accompanied by a lower monthly grant. In a few States both the average grant and the number of families aided in such areas were low.

[60] The large number of families aided in New York City, Wayne County, Mich., and St. Louis County, Minn., raises the rates for counties including large cities in these States.

Information as to the extent to which the agencies administering mothers' aid laws were limiting their intake of cases because of lack of funds was obtained for only a few localities. Pennsylvania was the only State from which complete figures were obtained. On June 30, 1931, there were in this State 6,066 families receiving aid and 2,633 families on the waiting list. As a result of this demonstrated need State appropriations were increased, and when these funds became available the waiting list was promptly reduced and the rate of families aided was increased. Pennsylvania provides aid only for widows or for families in which the father is permanently confined in an institution for the insane. With legislative provision for other groups of families and correspondingly increased appropriations, the rate in Pennsylvania would probably be materially higher.

The number of families aided in a State is undoubtedly influenced by legal restrictions as to the types of families that may receive mothers' aid, but the limitations imposed by appropriations and by administrative policies appear to be much more important factors. The number of families aided per 10,000 population in the 10 States that might grant aid to any mother varied from 23 in Nevada to 4 in Indiana, Mississippi, and in New Hampshire. As compared with other New England States, Connecticut, one of the two States granting aid to widows only, had a higher rate than New Hampshire, Rhode Island, and Vermont, and only slightly lower than Maine and Massachusetts, although all these States, except Vermont, provide for any needy mother.

EXPENDITURES FOR ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICES

Information as to the amounts spent for administration and services to families was obtained from a relatively small number of administrative agencies. Except in urban areas providing a separate staff, and in the States that have set up a special local agency to administer mothers' aid, it is difficult to allocate expenditures because mothers' aid is only one of the many activities carried on by such local agencies as the juvenile courts, county commissioners or other poor officials, or county welfare boards authorized to administer mothers' aid in the different States. Expenditures for all or most of the administrative agencies in the State were obtained from only six States. In two of these (Delaware and New Hampshire) the State is the administrative agency. In Maine and Rhode Island major responsibility for administration is placed on the State but local municipal or county boards have certain duties in regard to mothers' aid and may employ a part-time or full-time worker. In New York and Pennsylvania a special county board has been provided to administer mothers' aid, the State department having responsibility for supervision rather than for administration.

Table 2 gives as far as reported the amount spent for administration and the percentage of the total expenditures used in each State for this purpose. The figures for Delaware and New Hampshire include all administrative expenditures. Only State administrative expenditures were available for Maine and Rhode Island. In both of these States some paid service had been provided by a few of the local boards that are assisting the State department in its administration of mothers' aid. In Pennsylvania both State and local funds may be

used by the local administrative agency for administrative purposes, but in New York only local funds are used. The figures for these two States include all administrative expenditures of the counties which reported but do not include State expenditures for supervision of the work of the local administrative agency.

TABLE 2.—*Total expenditure for mothers' aid and expenditures for administration and services to mothers in certain States*

State	Expenditures during year ended June 30, 1931		
	Total	Administration and services to mothers	
		Amount	Percent
Delaware	$92,215.00	$8,650.00	9
Maine	238,701.75	18,056.75	8
New Hampshire	44,999.92	3,324.92	7
New York	[1] 10,199,884.85	468,619.60	5
Pennsylvania	2,739,929.52	240,108.50	9
Rhode Island	126,500.00	8,500.00	7

[1] Excluding grants to families in 8 counties not reporting administrative expenses.

From 5 to 9 percent of the total expenditures in the State or in areas reporting was spent for services and administration in these six States. The expenditures for New York State are dominated by New York City, which spent only 4 percent on services and administration. Administrative expenditures in other sections of New York constitute 7 percent of the total budget for these areas. Experts estimate that 10 to 15 percent of the total appropriation should be used for administration, as social services for the families are necessary to secure the largest returns from the grants.[61] The proportion of the appropriation that should be used for administration will be influenced by statutory limitations on the allowances that can be given to families, as the cost of services is the same whether the allowance is large or small.

The administrative expenditures of mothers' aid agencies in 32 cities of 100,000 or more population, or in counties containing such cities, are shown in appendix table A-V, on page 30. More than half of these units (18) were using at least 7 percent of their total appropriation for administrative purposes, and 9 allowed 10 percent or more. The need of funds for administration and services has been recognized in the mothers' aid law of Pennsylvania, which provides that not more than one tenth of the total State and county appropriation shall be used for administrative purposes in the various counties. All the Pennsylvania counties that included large cities were using for services the maximum allowed by the law. The small administrative expenditures reported by some cities may be due to incomplete figures, resulting from the difficulty of allocating administrative expenditures in an agency responsible for several different types of work for which certain staff members may be used in common. It is evident, however, that in many jurisdictions inadequate provision has been made for the employment of a staff large enough to provide the services needed by the families.

[61] The Dependent Child. (In press.)

EXPENDITURES FOR MOTHERS' AID BY CITIES AND COUNTIES

With the exception of those States in which State administration has resulted in fairly uniform provisions throughout the State, much variation existed in the per capita expenditures for mothers' aid in individual administrative units. This situation was found even in States in which State funds had been provided, since unless mothers' aid is financed entirely by the State the extent to which State funds are available is influenced by the willingness or ability of the local units to make appropriations. Pennsylvania was outstanding in the comparative uniformity of the average monthly grant and in per capita expenditures for mothers' aid families throughout the State. The excellent educational program and the close cooperation of the State department with local boards of mothers' assistance have probably had much to do with this.

Reports from the smaller administrative units showed that in many States per capita expenditures were high in some counties, whereas in adjoining counties the low per capita expenditure might indicate little understanding of the needs of dependent families. Appendix table A-VI (p. 33) gives a general picture of the per capita expenditure for mothers' aid in the less populous counties of States administering aid on a county basis. More than half of the counties reporting aid given had spent less than 30 cents per capita for this purpose. In 10 States [62] all the counties had expended less than 30 cents per capita. In many of the remaining States a few counties had made very liberal provision for mothers' aid. In 6 States [63] more than one tenth of the counties reporting had spent 90 cents or more per capita.

Information as to larger administrative units is shown in more detail in appendix table A-V, page 30. In a number of States much uniformity is found in the amount of the average monthly grant provided in administrative units including large cities. In other States there is evidently wide variation in the standards of administrative agencies in the different cities or counties, some having a large average grant, others a small one. Little uniformity is to be found usually in the number of families aided per 10,000 population. Of the 82 administrative units for which figures are given in table A-V, 52 were aiding less than 10 families per 10,000 population, 26 were granting aid to at least 10 but less than 20 families, and 4 were assisting more than 20 families. In a number of administrative units providing fairly large grants, notably the District of Columbia, Marion County (Ind.), Baltimore (Md.)[64], and Springfield (Mass.) the number of families aided per 10,000 population was very small. Rates of 20 or more families per 10,000 population were found in Duval County (Fla), St. Louis County (Minn.), Mercer County (N.J.), and New York (N.Y.), but the average grants in these four administrative units were smaller than those of other counties including large cities in the State in which each is located.

Exclusive of the 8 counties in California and New Jersey for which complete information as to expenditures was not available, the amount of the average monthly grant was $60 or more in 8 counties or cities,

[62] Arizona, Arkansas, Louisiana, Maryland, Mississippi, Missouri, North Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, and Virginia.
[63] California, Michigan, Montana, Nevada, Utah, and Wisconsin.
[64] Appropriations in Baltimore were limited by law to $30,000 a year.

$40 to $59 in 24 counties or cities, $20 to $39 in 30 counties or cities, and less than $20 in 12 counties or cities. Some differences exist in the cost of living in different localities, but these differences are probably not great because all the areas include a large city. Unless supplemented from other sources, many of the grants are quite limited. As was noted earlier, legal limitations on the size of the grant that can be given are seriously handicapping some of these cities in providing for dependent families.

During 1931 and 1932 the Children's Bureau received monthly reports as to the number of families receiving mothers' aid and the total expenditures for grants during these months, from 63 of the 82 cities of 100,000 population included in appendix table A-V, page 30. An analysis of the changes in expenditures and in the number of families aided in these cities during these 2 years is presented in appendix B, page 35.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

During the 20 years since the first State-wide mothers' aid law was enacted in 1911, special legislation providing public aid for the care in their own homes of dependent children deprived for various reasons of the support of their fathers has been enacted in all the 48 States except Georgia and South Carolina. Two States passed mothers' aid laws in 1931—New Mexico in March and Alabama in July. (See footnote 2, p. 2.)

Much variation existed in the extent to which mothers' aid laws had been put into operation in the 44 States that reported mothers' aid figures in 1931. In only 13 States were all the administrative units granting aid. In 16 other States three fourths or more of the counties or cities authorized were granting aid, but in 15 States little progress had been made, although in some of these States the statutes had been on the books for many years. Traditions and attitudes toward the use of public funds for the relief of dependent persons vary greatly in different parts of the country and are reflected in the extent to which mothers' aid laws are put into operation. The appropriation of State funds to assist local administrative agencies in providing for families and the services and guidance of a State agency have had a significant place in the development of a State-wide mothers' aid program in a number of States.

Some fairly definite trends in mothers' aid legislation can be traced through study of the amendments or revisions that have been made in existing mothers' aid laws and of the provisions of newly enacted laws. One of the most significant of these is the gradual broadening in the definition of the persons eligible for assistance, thus making it possible to provide aid to many families that previously could not obtain this form of public assistance. The number of States that have made possible the granting of aid to children until they are at least 16 years of age is steadily increasing. Recognition of the principle that children for whom the public assumes responsibility should be brought up under satisfactory standards of living has resulted, in a number of States, in increases in the amount of the maximum grant established by the law. Another definite trend found in recent legislation is increasing provision for participation by the State through the use of State funds to assist local units in providing mothers' aid allowances

or through making the services of a State agency available to local administrative agencies.

The amounts provided from tax sources for the care of dependent children in their own homes in different parts of the country varied widely. Average annual expenditures in the different States for all administrative areas granting mothers' aid ranged from 3 cents to 82 cents per capita. In individual counties or cities annual expenditures ranged from less than one half cent to as much as $2.61 per capita.

In a large proportion of the administrative units that reported figures, funds were too limited to provide adequately for all the families made eligible for assistance by the statutes. In localities in which standards of administration were high and in which other agencies were available to care for dependent families, there was a definite tendency, under these circumstances, to limit the number of families accepted for care, in order that allowances for families should not fall below an amount necessary to assure normal and satisfactory development for the children for whom the public had accepted responsibility. Average monthly grants for all administrative areas in the different States varied from $4.33 to $69.31. With average monthly grants in 21 States falling below the median grant of $21.78 per family, it is evident that allowances in many localities had been affected by the attempt to divide limited funds among many families. Such allowances bear no relation to the actual needs of the families. Mothers' aid is not an emergency measure. It is a long-time program to prevent the breaking up of families and to assure care for dependent children in their own homes, often during the most formative years of their lives. Every effort should be made to provide allowances that will maintain a satisfactory standard of living in these families.

APPENDIX A.—TABLES

TABLE A-I.—*Status of father in families receiving mother's aid on June 30, 1931* [1]

Division and State [2]	Families for which status of father was reported									
	Total	Father dead		Father deserting	Parents divorced	Father disabled physically	Father disabled mentally	Father imprisoned	Mother unmarried	Other status
		Number	Percent							
Total	60,119	49,477	82	3,296	1,369	2,325	1,984	1,596	55	17
New England:										
Maine	608	496	82	27	39	26	18	2		
New Hampshire	175	163	93	5	1		6			
Vermont	90	80	89	3		1	6			
Massachusetts	1,564	1,197	77	122	25	156	40	24		
Rhode Island	379	332	88	15	7	9	13	3		
Connecticut	959	959	100							
Middle Atlantic:										
New York	17,472	15,469	88	375		631	737	259	1	
Pennsylvania	6,066	5,866	97				200			
East North Central:										
Ohio	7,834	6,436	82	456	33	397	253	255	4	
Indiana	1,018	828	81	69	39	17	23	39	3	
Illinois	1,389	1,087	78	157	22	60	46	14	3	
Michigan	3,060	1,991	65	356	173	150	120	253	17	
West North Central:										
Minnesota	3,518	2,500	71	329	66	335	105	182	1	
Iowa	2,333	2,186	94	5	1	5	44	92		
Missouri	184	125	68	12	4	18	13	10		2
North Dakota	872	633	73	99	43	37	31	28	1	
South Dakota	1,157	880	76	23	173	25	22	33		1
Nebraska	1,106	659	60	230	75	57	26	45	14	
Kansas	352	226	64	45	33	19	5	16		8
South Atlantic:										
Delaware	292	258	88	17	3	8	6			
Maryland	93	80	86			1	1	8	3	
District of Columbia	161	127	79	8	1	12	10	3		
West Virginia	309	238	77	21	5	22	12	10	1	
North Carolina	430	318	74	39	2	11	6	54		
Florida	1,630	1,040	64	198	219	75	65	33		
East South Central:										
Kentucky	117	81	69	21		4	5	6		
Tennessee	199	181	91	5		5	7	1		
Mississippi	34	30	[3]	1				2	1	
West South Central:										
Arkansas	56	45	80	2		7		2		
Louisiana	33	32	[3]	1						
Oklahoma	1,346	1,175	87	24	3	13	44	87		
Texas	250	174	70	33	6	22	6	8		1
Mountain:										
Montana	731	648	89	10	5	35	9	21		3
Wyoming	95	69	73	12	2	4	8			
Colorado	655	477	73	93	45	11	22	7		
Utah	613	589	96	15	5	3	1			
Nevada	160	141	88	7	4	5		2	1	
Pacific:										
Washington	2,205	1,187	54	433	326	120	61	71	5	2
Oregon	574	474	83	28	9	24	13	26		

[1] A few administrative units in Colorado, Florida, Iowa, Kansas, Michigan, Minnesota, Nebraska, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Oklahoma, and Tennessee reported for families receiving aid during the year ended June 30, 1931.

[2] Status of father not reported by Arizona, California, Idaho, New Jersey, Virginia, and Wisconsin.

[3] Percent not shown because number was less than 50.

TABLE A-II.—*Race of mother in families receiving mothers' aid on June 30, 1931*[1], *and number and percentage of Negro families in the areas reporting race*

Division and State[2]	Families for which race of mother was reported					Negro families in areas reporting (1930 census)	
	Total	White	Negro		Other	Number	Percent
			Number	Percent			
New England:							
Maine	608	607	1	(3)		259	(3)
New Hampshire	175	175				117	(3)
Vermont	90	90				135	(3)
Rhode Island	388	384	4	1		2,542	2
Connecticut	959	916	43	4		7,174	2
Middle Atlantic:							
New York	3,734	3,657	66	2	11	17,809	1
Pennsylvania	6,066	[4] 5,700	366	6		98,942	5
East North Central:							
Ohio	7,251	6,806	361	5	84	73,954	5
Indiana	1,083	1,074	9	1		27,368	4
Illinois	1,497	1,445	51	3	1	4,724	1
Michigan	2,962	2,877	71	2	14	3,247	1
West North Central:							
Minnesota	3,485	3,456	16	(3)	13	2,592	(3)
Iowa	2,304	2,222	47	2	35	3,704	1
Missouri	173	159	14	8		12,769	8
North Dakota	765	763			2	84	(3)
South Dakota	1,135	1,132	2	(3)	1	120	(3)
Nebraska	948	945	3	(3)		560	(3)
Kansas	345	301	44	13		3,807	3
South Atlantic:							
Delaware	314	286	27	9	1	7,682	13
Maryland	93	78	15	16		38,614	15
District of Columbia	161	87	74	46		29,995	24
West Virginia	285	276	9	3		5,264	5
North Carolina	429	425	4	1		169,976	29
Florida	2,006	1,976	30	1		73,069	27
East South Central:							
Kentucky (Jefferson County)	117	92	25	21		14,622	16
Tennessee	194	191	3	2		46,778	35
Mississippi	34	34				8,720	68
West South Central:							
Arkansas	56	55	1	2		5,917	17
Louisiana	69	69				27,767	44
Oklahoma	1,203	1,096	91	8	16	16,882	6
Texas	211	207	1	(3)	3	29,457	19
Mountain:							
Montana	819	802	4	(3)	13	447	(3)
Wyoming	95	95				124	1
Colorado	650	638	7	1	5	3,353	1
Utah	628	626	1	(3)	1	311	(3)
Nevada	167	165			2	164	1
Pacific:							
Washington	1,904	1,883	13	1	8	1,750	1
Oregon	574	571	1	(3)	2	139	(3)
California	2,620	2,414	52	2	154	7,753	1

[1] Some administrative units in Florida, Iowa, Kansas, Michigan, Minnesota, Nebraska, New York, North Carolina, Oklahoma, and Tennessee reported for families receiving aid during the year ended June 30, 1931.

[2] Race of mother not reported by Arizona, Idaho, Massachusetts, New Jersey, Virginia, and Wisconsin.

[3] Less than 1 percent.

[4] Includes white and other.

TABLE A-III.—*Race of mother in families receiving mothers' aid on June 30, 1931, in administrative units having cities of 100,000 or more population and having at least 10 percent or 10,000 Negro population in the units reporting race*

State and administrative unit [1]	City with 100,000 or more population	Families for which race of mother was reported					Negro families in administrative unit (1930 census)	
		Total	White	Negro		Other		
				Number	Percent [2]		Number	Percent
Delaware: New Castle Co	Wilmington	202	187	14	7	1	4,363	11
District of Columbia	Washington	161	87	74	46	-------	29,995	24
Florida:								
Dade Co	Miami	158	140	18	11	-------	7,538	19
Duval Co	Jacksonville	[3] 528	524	4	1	-------	13,503	35
Hillsborough Co	Tampa	210	205	5	2	-------	7,447	19
Indiana:								
Lake Co	Gary	126	125	1	1	-------	5,764	10
Marion Co	Indianapolis	20	20	-------	-------	-------	12,023	11
Kentucky: Jefferson Co	Louisville	117	92	25	21	-------	14,622	16
Maryland: Baltimore City	Baltimore	52	40	12	23	-------	33,102	17
Missouri: Jackson Co	Kansas City	83	74	9	11	-------	11,750	9
New York:								
Erie Co	Buffalo	540	530	10	2	-------	3,818	2
Westchester Co	Yonkers	239	232	7	3	-------	4,452	4
Ohio:								
Cuyahoga Co	Cleveland	903	813	90	10	-------	17,979	6
Franklin Co	Columbus	338	303	35	10	-------	8,681	9
Hamilton Co	Cincinnati	451	412	39	9	-------	14,483	9
Lucas Co	Toledo	263	249	14	5	-------	3,267	4
Mahoning Co	Youngstown	138	130	8	6	-------	4,234	8
Montgomery Co	Dayton	163	145	18	11	-------	4,514	6
Oklahoma: Oklahoma Co	Oklahoma	154	124	29	19	1	4,103	7
Pennsylvania:								
Allegheny Co	Pittsburgh	907	[4] 831	76	8	-------	19,171	6
Philadelphia Co	Philadelphia	1,336	[4] 1,116	220	16	-------	50,997	11
Tennessee:								
Knox Co	Knoxville	[3] 36	33	3	-------	-------	4,618	13
Shelby Co	Memphis	111	111	-------	-------	-------	36,365	45
Texas: Harris Co	Houston	110	110	-------	-------	-------	19,340	21

[1] Race of mother was not reported by any administrative units in Massachusetts, New Jersey, Virginia, and Wisconsin, nor by units having cities of 100,000 or more population and having at least 10 percent or 10,000 Negro population in California, Alameda and Los Angeles Counties; Illinois, Cook County; Michigan Wayne County; Missouri, St. Louis city; Nebraska, Douglas County; New York, New York City; Ohio, Summit County; Oklahoma, Tulsa County; Texas, Dallas County.

[2] Percent not shown where the number of families was less than 50.

[3] Reported for families receiving aid during the year ended June 30, 1931.

[4] Includes white and other.

TABLE A-IV.—*Expenditure for grants and number of families aided per 10,000 population [1] in areas reporting mothers' aid grants*

Division and State	Expenditure for grants during year ended June 30, 1931 [2]				Expenditure for grants in June 1931 [3]				Number of families receiving aid on June 30, 1931,[4] per 10,000 population		
	Total	Per capita			Total	Average monthly grant per family			State	Areas having cities of 100,000 or more population	Other areas
		State	Areas having cities of 100,000 or more population	Other areas		State	Areas having cities of 100,000 or more population	Other areas			
Total	$33,885,487.36	$0.38	$0.48	$0.29	$2,993,175.04	$31.97	$43.50	$22.51	10	10	11
New England:											
Maine	220,645.00	.28	----	.28	18,338.00	30.16	----	30.16	8	----	8
New Hampshire	41,675.00	.09	----	.09	3,460.00	19.77	----	19.77	4	----	4
Vermont	25,208.25	.07	----	.07	1,900.00	21.11	----	21.11	3	----	3
Massachusetts	2,343,000.00	.55	.75	.41	[5] 195,250.00	[5] 69.31	[5] 66.02	[5] 73.42	7	9	5
Rhode Island	241,705.48	.35	.34	.36	21,374.56	55.09	59.55	52.43	6	6	6
Connecticut	553,657.53	.34	.40	.32	44,023.74	45.91	46.68	45.50	6	7	6
Middle Atlantic:											
New York	10,025,626.77	.82	.96	.36	969,362.95	52.62	54.39	40.02	15	17	8
New Jersey	[6] 1,753,665.85	[6] .43	[6] .48	[6] .36	[6] 161,628.34	[6] 30.03	[6] 29.95	[6] 30.22	[6] 13	[6] 15	[6] 11
Pennsylvania	2,499,821.02	.26	.29	.25	227,185.52	37.45	37.68	37.25	6	7	6
East North Central:											
Ohio	1,947,547.07	.29	.35	.22	167,100.40	21.68	38.16	12.19	12	8	16
Indiana	325,791.81	.12	.09	.13	28,951.49	26.73	33.70	24.30	4	3	5
Illinois	1,905,206.81	.26	.28	.23	[5] 158,581.48	[5] 26.11	[5] 48.98	[5] 15.30	[7] 8	[7] 5	[7] 12
Michigan	2,836,995.93	.61	.68	.54	242,772.14	37.04	55.22	25.86	14	11	17
Wisconsin	1,833,198.92	.62	.53	.65	[5] 152,766.58	[5] 21.66	[5] 27.33	[5] 20.54	[7] 24	[7] 16	[7] 27
West North Central:											
Minnesota	1,208,790.86	.47	.58	.41	101,415.81	29.35	38.38	23.94	14	13	14
Iowa	797,195.22	.32	.37	.32	[5] 50,808.61	[5] 20.81	[5] 18.55	[5] 21.10	13	16	13
Missouri	86,516.00	.06	.06	.07	8,052.00	26.22	33.12	9.61	2	2	6
North Dakota	270,811.19	.48	----	.48	22,428.50	22.93	----	22.93	18	----	18
South Dakota	324,984.79	.52	----	.52	27,118.50	21.78	----	21.78	20	----	20
Nebraska	309,373.94	.24	.32	.23	25,878.66	17.81	19.98	17.22	[8] 11	[6] 13	[8] 11
Kansas	58,687.75	.13	.07	.15	4,510.73	14.05	10.33	14.24	8	7	8
South Atlantic:											
Delaware	83,565.00	.35	.35	.36	7,437.40	23.69	25.21	20.94	13	13	14
Maryland	45,758.70	.04	.04	.04	3,693.10	30.52	49.55	16.18	1	1	2
District of Columbia [9]	125,195.39	----	.26	----	10,598.50	----	65.83	----	----	3	----

Virginia	21,320.00	.08	.05	.15	1,816.67	16.52	30.86	11.85	4	2	11
West Virginia	63,838.00	.10		.10	5,103.00	15.46		15.46	5		5
North Carolina	82,368.90	.03		.03	7,203.07	16.64		16.64	2		2
South Carolina	No mothers' aid law on June 30, 1931.										
Georgia	No mothers' aid law on June 30, 1931.										
Florida	282,166.42	.24	.36	.16	21,794.13	10.01	15.69	6.24	20	19	20
East South Central:											
Kentucky (Jefferson County) [9]	62,968.86		.18		5,428.58		46.40			3	
Tennessee [10]	60,311.56	.11	.11	.12	5,089.00	26.78	30.54	16.55	3	3	6
Alabama	No mothers' aid law on June 30, 1931.										
Mississippi	5,320.00	.05		.05	500.00	11.11		11.11	4		4
West South Central:											
Arkansas	21,426.50	.06		.06	567.25	4.33		4.33	[8] 5		[8] 5
Louisiana	8,165.00	.03		.03	693.84	10.06		10.06	3		3
Oklahoma	140,129.25	.09	.04	.11	11,983.93	7.29	4.78	6.59	[8] 12	[8] 7	[8] 13
Texas	64,838.82	.06	.07	.04	5,540.27	12.07	12.40	9.82	4	5	4
Mountain:											
Montana	242,753.21	.53		.53	20,790.37	24.78		24.78	18		18
Idaho	36,314.50	.09		.09	[8] 3,026.21	[8] 13.16		[8] 13.16	[8] 6		[8] 6
Wyoming	25,334.40	.29		.29	2,142.50	22.55		22.55	11		11
Colorado	204,854.70	.23	.33	.18	17,225.73	26.50	42.88	19.78	7	7	8
New Mexico	Law passed in 1931.										
Arizona	25,280.00	.06		.06	2,260.00	17.25		17.25	3		3
Utah	90,538.00	.28	.26	.32	7,391.00	11.77	12.57	10.94	19	16	24
Nevada	47,349.00	.64		.64	4,135.00	24.76		24.76	23		23
Pacific:											
Washington	558,643.70	.36	.31	.41	49,484.47	19.66	20.20	19.27	16	14	18
Oregon	191,759.16	.26	.25	.27	17,869.50	21.35	33.29	15.88	11	8	15
California	[11] 1,785,183.10	[11] .31	[11] .25	[11] .42	[11] 148,493.51	[11] 31.40	[11] 27.94	[11] 35.41	8	7	10

[1] Based on population reported in the 1930 census.
[2] In a few instances administrative units reported for a year ended on some other date.
[3] In a few instances administrative units reported for a month other than June 1931.
[4] In a few instances administrative units reported for some other specified date.
[5] Estimate.
[6] Report comprises aid given under Home Life Act only.
[7] Number receiving mothers' aid during the year ended June 30, 1931.
[8] Includes for a few administrative units the number receiving aid during the year ended June 30, 1931.
[9] Single administrative area including a large city.
[10] Most of the families in urban administrative units.
[11] Includes State expenditure only in counties for which county expenditure was not reported.

TABLE A-V.—*Expenditures for mothers' aid grants and administration and services, number of families and children receiving aid, and average monthly grant per family in administrative units reporting which had cities of 100,000 or more population*

State and administrative unit	City	Expenditures during year ended June 30, 1931 [1]				Number of families receiving aid on June 30, 1931 [2]	Number of children receiving aid on June 30, 1931 [2]	Number of families receiving aid on June 30, 1931, per 10,000 population [2]	Average monthly grant per family during June 1931 [3]
		Grants		Administration and services					
		Total	Per capita	Amount	Percent of total				
California:									
Alameda County	Oakland	$234,421.44	$0.49			560	1,288	12	$34.07
Los Angeles County	Los Angeles, Long Beach	[4] 350,026.57	[4] .16			1,027	2,611	5	[4] 27.77
San Diego County	San Diego	58,047.85	.28			122	356	6	31.04
San Francisco County	San Francisco	[4] 234,266.97	[4] .37			829	1,746	13	[4] 23.55
Colorado: Denver County	Denver	96,360.00	.33			189	662	7	42.88
Connecticut:									
Bridgeport (city)	Bridgeport	41,759.87	.28			67	179	5	46.17
Hartford (city)	Hartford	59,043.00	.36			103	269	6	47.31
New Haven (city)	New Haven	89,584.21	.55			159	441	10	46.48
Delaware: New Castle County	Wilmington	55,565.00	.35			202	546	13	25.21
District of Columbia	Washington	125,195.39	.26	$12,993.09	9	161	595	3	65.83
Florida:									
Dade County	Miami	58,193.00	.41			159	477	11	30.36
Duval County	Jacksonville	57,669.50	.37			470	1,034	30	10.23
Hillsborough County	Tampa	48,000.00	.31			240	545	16	16.67
Illinois:									
Cook County	Chicago	1,108,439.50	.28			[5] 1,812	[5] 5,547	[5] 5	50.98
Peoria County	Peoria	34,060.00	.24			[5] 132	[5] 222	[5] 9	21.50
Indiana:									
Allen County	Fort Wayne	11,435.00	.08			40	146	3	26.30
Lake County	Gary	40,206.00	.15			126	321	5	29.90
Marion County	Indianapolis	14,521.20	.03			20	70	(6)	58.01
St. Joseph County	South Bend	24,728.70	.15			51	175	3	44.00
Vanderburgh County	Evansville	7,428.20	.07			43	112	4	28.19
Iowa: Polk County	Des Moines	63,883.00	.37	4,160.00	7	278	646	16	18.55
Kansas: Sedgwick County	Wichita	10,175.00	.07			92	173	7	10.33
Kentucky: Jefferson County	Louisville	62,968.86	.18	12,146.11	16	117	405	3	46.40
Maryland: Baltimore (city)	Baltimore	31,913.20	.04	2,800.32	8	52	241	1	49.55
Massachusetts:									
Boston (city)	Boston	827,908.98	1.06			927	1,926	12	68.38
Cambridge (city)	Cambridge	99,804.70	.88			117	280	10	72.52
Fall River (city)	Fall River	45,684.65	.40			65	199	6	59.92
Lowell (city)	Lowell	91,652.18	.91			134	361	13	56.49

Lynn (city)	Lynn	54,569.03	.53			65	159	6	66.92
New Bedford (city)	New Bedford	49,289.89	.44			69	196	6	52.72
Somerville (city)	Somerville	38,088.42	.37			46	101	4	60.17
Springfield (city)	Springfield	37,253.10	.25			39	110	3	72.36
Worcester (city)	Worcester	81,973.64	.42			102	260	5	62.12
Michigan:									
Genesee County	Flint	133,151.93	.63	2,069.70	2	204	545	10	52.68
Kent County	Grand Rapids	113,827.00	.47			288	934	12	34.28
Wayne County	Detroit	1,335,029.37	.71			2,003	5,608	11	58.49
Minnesota:									
Hennepin County	Minneapolis	208,912.59	.40	13,140.00	6	418	1,388	8	45.86
Ramsey County	St. Paul	171,117.00	.60			381	1,093	13	37.63
St. Louis County	Duluth	203,430.50	.99	11,527.50	5	496	1,427	24	32.64
Missouri:									
Jackson County	Kansas City	24,063.00	.05	3,750.00	13	83	280	2	24.78
St. Louis (city)	St. Louis	52,846.00	.06			134	[7] 496	2	38.28
Nebraska: Douglas County	Omaha	74,572.44	.32			[5] 311	[5] 1,022	[5] 13	19.98
New Jersey:									
Camden County	Camden	[6] 111,596.02	[6].44			[5] 323	[5] 838	[5] 13	[5] 31.43
Essex County	Newark	[5] 363,478.67	[5].44			[5] 1,084	[5] 2,495	[5] 13	[5] 31.51
Hudson County	Jersey City	[5] 390,641.27	[5].57			[5] 1,307	[5] 2,770	[5] 19	[5] 27.77
Mercer County	Trenton	[5] 123,634.65	[5].66			[5] 380	[5] 923	[5] 20	[5] 28.44
Passaic County	Paterson	[5] 117,667.46	[5].39			[5] 344	[5] 845	[5] 11	[5] 30.19
Union County	Elizabeth	[5] 116,878.76	[5].38			[5] 328	[5] 947	[5] 11	[5] 33.52
New York:									
Albany County	Albany	91,691.00	.43	6,991.50	7	188	509	9	40.72
Erie County	Buffalo	341,856.22	.45	33,271.98	9	540	1,646	7	56.90
Monroe County	Rochester	144,415.40	.34	12,635.97	8	263	780	6	49.03
New York City	New York City	8,051,637.40	1.16	347,207.99	4	14,568	37,359	21	54.47
Oneida County	Utica	139,389.22	.70	6,100.00	4	235	756	12	52.49
Onondaga County	Syracuse	68,230.00	.23	3,800.00	5	116	387	4	53.28
Westchester County	Yonkers	166,004.00	.32			239	672	5	62.94
Oregon: Multnomah County	Portland	85,475.00	.25			263	[7] 658	8	33.29
Ohio:									
Cuyahoga County	Cleveland	513,599.34	.43	49,884.45	9	903	2,821	8	48.69
Franklin County	Columbus	137,811.00	.38	[9] 6,303.45	4	338	1,126	9	34.38
Hamilton County	Cincinnati	246,091.00	.42	13,876.00	5	451	1,374	8	46.27
Lucas County	Toledo	105,444.00	.30	7,570.00	7	310	847	9	29.15
Mahoning County	Youngstown	66,480.00	.28	2,868.20	4	130	368	6	39.62
Montgomery County	Dayton	65,000.00	.24	3,500.00	5	163	470	6	33.75
Stark County	Canton	73,110.00	.33	1,800.00	2	195	590	9	32.38
Summit County	Akron	59,708.50	.17	1,850.00	3	326	783	9	15.32
Oklahoma:									
Oklahoma County	Oklahoma City	8,000.00	.04	1,800.00	18	154	358	7	4.33
Tulsa County	Tulsa	8,000.00	.04			125	347	7	5.33

[1] In a few instances the report was for a year ended on some other date.
[2] In a few instances the report was as of some other specified date.
[3] In a few instances the report was for some other month.
[4] Only State expenditure; county expenditure not reported.
[5] Number receiving aid during the year ended June 30, 1931.
[6] Less than 1 per 10,000.
[7] Estimate.
[8] Report comprises aid given under Home Life Act only.
[9] Includes expenditures for administration of other types of work.

TABLE A-V.—*Expenditures for mothers' aid grants and administration and services, number of families and children receiving aid, and average monthly grant per family in administrative units reporting which had cities of 100,000 or more population*—Continued

State and administrative unit	City	Expenditures during year ended June 30, 1931				Number of families receiving aid on June 30, 1931	Number of children receiving aid on June 30, 1931	Number of families receiving aid on June 30, 1931, per 10,000 population	Average monthly grant per family during June 1931
		Grants		Administration and services					
		Total	Per capita	Amount	Percent of total				
Pennsylvania:									
Allegheny County	Pittsburgh	$381,816.92	$0.28	$42,125.26	10	907	2,743	7	$37.53
Berks County	Reading	67,470.00	.29	7,434.40	10	166	471	7	35.99
Erie County	Erie	43,026.98	.25	4,696.98	10	112	326	6	38.06
Lackawanna County	Scranton	107,080.22	.34	11,677.86	10	275	923	9	38.58
Philadelphia	Philadelphia	561,422.84	.29	62,364.78	10	1,336	4,282	7	37.79
Rhode Island: Providence (city)	Providence	86,289.50	.34			145	465	6	59.55
Tennessee:									
Knox County	Knoxville	10,083.56	.06			28	126	2	30.00
Shelby County	Memphis	40,000.00	.13			111	275	4	30.68
Texas:									
Harris County	Houston	19,567 00	.05			110	330	3	15.18
Dallas County	Dallas	29,726.00	.09			229	[7] 664	7	11.07
Utah: Salt Lake County	Salt Lake City	49,705.00	.26	1,860.00	4	319	987	16	12.57
Virginia: Richmond (city)	Richmond	10,000.00	.05			27	80	1	30.86
Washington:									
King County	Seattle	136,120.00	.29	10,200.00	7	620	1,458	13	20.29
Pierce County	Tacoma	65,670.00	.40	4,000.00	6	300	660	18	18.17
Spokane County	Spokane	37,495.00	.25	4,360.00	10	145	330	10	24.00
Wisconsin: Milwaukee County	Milwaukee	383,672.50	.53			[6] 1,170	[6] 3,326	[6] 16	27.33

[6] Number receiving aid during the year ended June 30, 1931.

[7] Estimate.

TABLE A-VI.—*Counties having no cities of 100,000 or more population, classified by per capita expenditure for mothers' aid grants during the year ended June 30, 1931, in specified States reporting grants*

Division and State [1]	Counties having no cities of 100,000 or more population							
	Total	Per capita expenditures						
		Less than 10 cents	10 to 29 cents	30 to 49 cents	50 to 69 cents	70 to 89 cents	90 cents and more	Not reported
Total	1,416	284	531	343	128	63	53	14
Middle Atlantic:								
New York	42	2	16	16	6	2		
New Jersey [2]	15		3	11	1			
Pennsylvania	52	1	43	8				
East North Central:								
Ohio	80	3	60	17				
Indiana	65	26	33	6				
Illinois	88	10	52	19	5		1	1
Michigan	72	3	21	15	12	12	8	1
Wisconsin	70		6	14	22	15	13	
West North Central:								
Minnesota	82	3	23	39	9	5	3	
Iowa	97	3	38	48	7		1	
Missouri	9	8	1					
North Dakota	44	1	9	16	8	9	1	
South Dakota	60	2	12	18	14	10	3	1
Nebraska	81	4	54	19	3		1	
Kansas	31	10	15	5				1
South Atlantic:								
Delaware	2			2				
Maryland	6	5	1					
Virginia	2	1	1					
West Virginia	17	8	7	1				1
North Carolina	81	81						
Florida	38	6	22	6				4
East South Central:								
Tennessee	2	1	1					
Mississippi	3	3						
West South Central:								
Arkansas	13	13						
Louisiana	7	7						
Oklahoma	46	21	21	2				2
Texas	20	14	4					2
Mountain:								
Montana	46	3	10	17	10	1	5	
Idaho	38	25	11	1	1			
Wyoming	10	2	3	2	3			
Colorado	41	6	24	6	2	2	1	
Arizona	14	11	3					
Utah	14		7	3	2		2	
Nevada	13		2	5		1	5	
Pacific:								
Washington	36	1	8	14	10	1	2	
Oregon	26		8	11	4	1	1	1
California [3]	53		12	22	9	4	6	

[1] Excludes the 6 New England States in which mothers' aid was administered through the cities and towns and Kentucky in which mothers' aid was granted in Louisville only.
[2] Report comprises expenditure under Home Life Act only.
[3] Includes State expenditure only in counties for which county expenditure was not reported.

APPENDIX B.—EXPENDITURES FOR MOTHERS' AID IN 1931 AND IN 1932

Comparable monthly figures on the number of families receiving mothers' aid and the expenditures for grants have been made available to the Children's Bureau since 1929 from 63 of the 82 cities of 100,000 or more population (see table A-V, p. 30) in which mothers' aid was being granted in June 1931. A summary of the information reported during 1931 and 1932 is presented in table B. The figures for 1931 are not identical with those given in table A-V, since the calendar year rather than the year ended June 30 was used. Furthermore, the areas covered by the reports were not always identical; some of the administrative agencies reported monthly figures for the city or metropolitan area rather than for the county. Other slight variations from the figures obtained in the 1931 survey are due to the use of the average number of families per month receiving aid rather than the number aided on a specified date, and to the calculation of an average monthly grant based on expenditures of 12 months rather than on a single month.

TABLE B.—*Annual expenditure for mothers' aid grants, average monthly number of families receiving aid, and average monthly grant per family in 1931 and in 1932 in 63 cities or city areas of 100,000 or more population*

State and city	Area covered	Annual expenditure for grants			Average monthly number of families receiving aid			Average monthly grant per family		
		1931	1932	Percent change	1931	1932	Percent change	1931	1932	Percent change
California:										
San Diego	County	$43,355	$54,350	+25.4	124	160	+29.0	$29.18	$28.26	−3.2
San Francisco	City and county	471,097	483,983	+2.7	889	937	+5.4	44.17	43.07	−2.5
Colorado: Denver	do	106,250	107,391	+1.1	205	208	+1.5	43.19	43.06	−0.3
Connecticut:										
Bridgeport	City	41,997	41,849	−0.4	68	73	+7.4	51.15	47.77	−6.6
Hartford	Area	62,856	77,851	+23.9	104	127	+22.1	50.33	51.18	+1.7
New Haven	do	99,024	108,727	+9.8	160	175	+9.4	51.74	51.65	−0.2
Delaware: Wilmington	City	39,971	43,297	+8.3	137	148	+8.0	24.37	24.32	−0.2
District of Columbia: Washington	do	135,089	135,647	+0.4	162	178	+9.9	69.45	63.59	−8.4
Illinois: Chicago	County	1,167,810	1,171,956	+0.4	1,875	1,909	+1.8	51.91	51.15	−1.5
Indiana:										
Evansville	do	15,001	13,699	−8.7	50	64	+28.0	25.13	17.79	−29.2
Fort Wayne	City	9,622	11,076	+15.1	30	37	+23.3	26.73	24.83	−7.1
Indianapolis	County	15,001	15,001	0.0	20	21	+5.0	62.50	60.49	−3.2
South Bend	City	30,117	38,499	+27.8	59	94	+59.3	42.78	34.19	−20.1
Iowa: Des Moines	County	63,884	63,956	+0.1	293	295	+0.7	18.17	18.06	−0.6
Kansas: Wichita	do	12,100	18,138	+49.9	65	101	+55.4	15.39	14.99	−2.6
Kentucky: Louisville	do	64,058	60,745	−5.2	117	121	+7.1	45.72	41.92	−8.3
Maryland: Baltimore	City	34,915	42,684	+22.3	54	66	+22.2	53.88	53.56	−0.6
Massachusetts:										
Boston	do	832,557	933,712	+12.1	950	1,099	+15.7	73.03	70.80	−3.1
Lowell	do	92,110	103,106	+11.9	133	142	+6.8	57.53	60.61	+5.4
Lynn	do	58,314	52,391	−10.2	75	70	−6.7	64.79	62.15	−4.1
Springfield	Area	39,143	30,502	−22.1	44	41	−6.8	74.13	61.37	−17.2
Worcester	City	83,033	85,974	+3.5	108	115	+6.5	64.22	62.39	−2.8
Michigan:										
Detroit	County	1,417,317	1,434,300	+1.2	2,077	2,419	+16.5	56.87	49.41	−13.1
Flint	do	139,146	155,710	+11.9	519	604	+16.4	22.34	21.48	−3.8
Grand Rapids	do	128,286	114,086	−11.1	286	317	+10.8	37.34	29.99	−19.7
Minnesota:										
Duluth	Part of county	107,259	116,328	+8.5	221	255	+15.4	40.52	37.99	−6.2
Minneapolis	County	238,863	272,989	+14.3	426	538	+26.3	46.75	42.30	−9.5
St. Paul	do	172,355	178,846	+3.8	381	390	+2.4	37.65	38.21	+1.5
Missouri: Kansas City	do	24,605	39,030	+58.6	84	124	+47.6	24.29	26.12	+7.5
Nebraska: Omaha	do	82,056	71,747	−12.6	276	274	−0.7	24.78	21.80	−12.0

New Jersey:										
Newark	City	274,424	336,929	+22.8	696	874	+25.6	32.87	32.14	−2.2
Jersey City	do	233,769	259,020	+10.8	623	718	+15.2	31.26	30.08	−3.8
Trenton	do	122,184	128,918	+5.5	339	375	+10.6	30.04	28.67	−4.6
New York:										
Albany	do	51,845	43,969	−15.2	103	95	−7.8	41.91	38.57	−8.0
Buffalo	County	361,980	376,414	+4.0	536	577	+7.6	56.23	54.36	−3.3
New York	City	9,379,222	10,476,588	+11.7	14,652	16,633	+13.5	53.34	52.49	−1.6
Rochester	County	154,672	166,977	+8.0	260	306	+17.7	49.48	45.40	−8.2
Syracuse	City	56,315	64,855	+15.2	91	99	+8.8	51.43	54.73	+6.4
Utica	do	66,149	90,304	+36.5	129	156	+20.9	42.87	48.16	+12.3
Yonkers	do	98,752	101,887	+3.2	125	133	+6.4	65.97	63.60	−3.6
Ohio:										
Akron	Area	59,845	60,000	+0.3	310	243	−21.6	16.08	20.58	+28.0
Canton	do	51,185	62,067	+21.3	129	164	+27.1	33.02	31.54	−4.5
Cincinnati	County	262,879	267,010	+1.6	469	487	+3.8	46.73	45.70	−2.2
Cleveland	do	545,262	560,222	+2.7	926	1,011	+9.2	49.06	46.19	−5.8
Columbus	do	148,867	157,721	+5.9	356	427	+19.9	34.81	30.77	−11.6
Dayton	do	65,104	76,330	+17.2	161	189	+17.4	33.68	33.58	−0.3
Toledo	do	111,089	135,085	+21.6	268	316	+17.9	34.60	35.64	+3.0
Youngstown	do	56,495	50,110	−11.3	111	103	−7.2	42.48	40.61	−4.4
Oregon: Portland	do	98,783	91,691	−7.2	262	283	+8.0	31.43	26.98	−14.2
Pennsylvania:										
Erie	County	59,319	68,383	+15.3	126	147	+16.7	39.08	38.88	−0.5
Philadelphia	City and county	622,980	702,265	+12.7	1,385	1,589	+14.7	37.50	36.83	−1.8
Pittsburgh	County	432,438	504,301	+16.6	962	1,136	+18.1	37.48	37.00	−1.3
Reading	do	74,604	89,764	+20.3	172	211	+22.7	36.23	35.47	−2.1
Scranton	City	72,067	74,287	+3.1	153	182	+19.0	39.29	34.00	−13.5
Rhode Island: Providence	do	90,849	96,228	+5.9	147	167	+13.6	51.41	48.16	−6.3
Tennessee: Memphis	County	41,564	37,480	−9.8	113	111	−1.8	30.54	28.10	−8.0
Texas:										
Dallas	do	29,726	28,542	−4.0	228	232	+1.8	10.86	10.24	−5.7
Houston	do	17,056	20,899	+22.5	94	112	+19.1	15.16	15.60	+2.9
Utah: Salt Lake City	do	50,125	48,730	−2.8	323	317	−1.9	12.95	12.82	−1.0
Virginia: Richmond	City and Henrico County.	10,655	8,364	−21.5	27	22	−18.5	33.30	31.92	−4.1
Washington:										
Seattle	County	150,845	145,970	−3.2	631	617	−2.2	19.93	19.70	−1.2
Tacoma	do	82,005	90,365	+10.2	338	412	+21.9	20.24	18.26	−9.8
Wisconsin: Milwaukee	do	592,115	693,213	+17.1	1,116	1,270	+13.8	44.20	45.47	+2.9

The changes from 1931 to 1932 in annual expenditures, number of families aided, and amount of the average monthly grant varied greatly in the different cities. In general, annual expenditures for grants were larger in 1932 than in 1931 in about three fourths of the cities. These increased expenditures had been made necessary by the even greater number of families aided, and, as a result, the average monthly grant was smaller in 1932, not only in cities in which expenditures were smaller but also in more than three fourths of the cities that had spent more money.

The percentage of change in annual expenditures from 1931 to 1932 ranged from an increase of 58.6 in Kansas City, Mo., to a decrease of 22.1 in Springfield, Mass. The extent of the increase or decrease in different cities is shown in the following list:

Percent of change from 1931 to 1932	Number of cities
Increase:	
30 or more	3
20, less than 30	9
10, less than 20	15
Less than 10	20
No change	1
Decrease:	
Less than 10	7
10, less than 20	6
20 or more	2

Decreases of 10 percent or more in annual expenditures were found in Lynn and Springfield, Mass.; Grand Rapids, Mich.; Omaha, Nebr.; Albany, N.Y.; Youngstown, Ohio; Memphis, Tenn.; and Richmond, Va.

The average number of families aided per month increased in 1932 in 53 cities and decreased in 10. The percentage of change in families aided ranged from an increase of 59.3 percent in South Bend, Ind., to a decrease of 21.6 percent in Akron, Ohio. This increase in families aided was found not only in the cities in which larger funds were provided but also in 6 cities [1] in which expenditures had decreased. Akron, Ohio, was the only one of the 10 cities [2] that reported a smaller average number of families aided in 1932 than in 1931 in which the number of families receiving aid had been greatly reduced. In the remaining cities the decrease in families was small (2 to 14 families) and was only notable because of the generally accepted opinion that the number of families of dependent children needing mothers' aid had increased during the period of general unemployment.

The average monthly grant per family provided in 10 cities [3] was larger in 1932 than in 1931, the percentage of increase ranging from 28 in Akron, Ohio, to 1.7 in Hartford, Conn. The increase in the average grant in Akron, from $16.08 to $20.58, had been accomplished with only slight increase in the total expenditure for grants by reducing the number of families aided. In the other cities larger allowances had been paid, although the average number of families receiving mothers aid had increased from 2.4 to 47.6 percent. The average grant in 53 cities was smaller in 1932 than in 1931, the percentage decrease ranging from less than 1 percent in Denver, Colo.; New Haven, Conn.; Wilmington, Del.; Des Moines, Iowa; Baltimore, Md.; Dayton, Ohio; and Erie, Pa., to 29.2 percent in Evansville, Ind.

With the cost of living lower in 1932 than in 1931, it might be expected that some reduction would be made in the size of mothers' aid grants. On the other hand, lack of employment for older members of the family and reductions in other supplementary sources of income for the family have tended to keep grants in many localities at about the same general level, with only slight change in the amount. The average monthly grant in 7 cities,[4] however, had been reduced by amounts ranging from $5.29 to $12.76. The amounts by which grants had been increased or decreased in 1932 in the 63 cities are shown in the following list:

[1] Bridgeport, Conn.; Evansville, Ind.; Louisville, Ky.; Grand Rapids, Mich.; Portland, Oreg.; Dallas, Tex.

[2] Lynn and Springfield, Mass.; Omaha, Nebr.; Albany, N.Y.; Akron and Youngstown, Ohio; Memphis, Tenn.; Salt Lake City, Utah; Richmond, Va.; and Seattle, Wash.

[3] Hartford, Conn.; Lowell, Mass.; St. Paul, Minn.; Kansas City, Mo.; Syracuse and Utica, N.Y.; Akron and Toledo, Ohio; Houston, Tex.; and Milwaukee, Wis.

[4] Washington, D.C.; Evansville and South Bend, Ind.; Springfield, Mass.; Detroit and Grand Rapids, Mich.; and Scranton, Pa.

Amount of increase or decrease in grants	Number of cities
Increase:	
$3 or more	4
$1, less than $3	3
Less than $1	3
Decrease:	
Less than $1	19
$1, less than $3	19
$3, less than $5	8
$5 or more	7

In about one third of the cities the increase or decrease had been less than $1 and in more than two thirds less than $3. Even a small reduction in the amount of the average grant may mean hardship to families when the grants were already too small to meet their needs.

BOSTON PUBLIC LIBRARY
3 9999 05708 5472

AUG 14 1934